

Library of

Wellesley



College.

Purchased from
Sweet Fund

No 58842

THE EXPOSITOR
VOL. XII.

List of Contributors to Volume XII.

- REV. PROFESSOR B. W. BACON, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR W. H. BENNETT, D.D., LITT.D.
VERY REV. J. H. BERNARD, D.D.
REV. ARTHUR CARR, M.A.
DOM CHAPMAN, O.S.B.
REV. ALEX. R. EAGAR, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR G. G. FINDLAY, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.
REV. H. J. GIBBINS, M.A., B.D.
PROFESSOR J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A.
J. H. A. HART, M.A.
REV. GEORGE JACKSON, B.A.
REV. M. KAUFMANN, M.A.
REV. F. WARBURTON LEWIS, B.A.
REV. GEORGE MILLIGAN, M.A., D.D.
REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.
REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, B.D.
PROFESSOR W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, D.C.L., LL.D.
PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D.
REV. C. ANDERSON SCOTT, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR G. A. SMITH, D.D., LL.D.
REV. NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D.
REV. PREBENDARY B. WHITEFOORD, M.A., D.D.
J. DE ZWAAN.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

SIXTH SERIES

Volume XII

London :

HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MCMIV.

58842

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

53
416
17
XTC. 6

ISAIAH'S JERUSALEM.

RECENT critics have been disposed to minimize the importance of Jerusalem during the period of the Double Kingdom, the two centuries and more between Rehoboam and Hezekiah. They have been moved to this by natural reaction from the tradition that the incomparable sacredness of the City had already been realized under Solomon, and by the just desire to emphasize the influence of the prophets in the gradual creation of her greatness. But the duty of showing how gradual this greatness was, and how essential to it were the contributions of the prophets cannot be discharged without appreciation of the political and religious importance, which Jerusalem had achieved before the times of the prophets and of which their own tributes to their City are the strongest certificates. Let us in a few sentences recall what that achievement had been.¹

The Disruption of the Kingdom deposed Jerusalem from her brief reign as the capital of all Israel. There was left to the City only the small province of Judah, while the reputation of her Temple was still obviously below that of a number of other sanctuaries in the land. Yet Jerusalem had the Dynasty of David, and the Ark of Jahweh with its comparatively pure ritual: both of them, as we can see, stronger guarantees for a great future than Israel at the time anywhere else possessed. Not that either of these securities had escaped challenge or serious danger. From the congenital heathenism of a part of her population²

¹ For details see the preceding articles in the *EXPOSITOR*, March to May 1905.

² Cf. Ezekiel xvi. 3.

and the foreign alliances of some of her kings, the City was naturally liable to outbreaks of idolatry; while the House of David suffered at least one overthrow and was almost extirpated.¹ From such disasters, however, both the dynasty and the religion emerged with a brighter lustre and a more articulate confidence in their destiny. Behind them was a considerable force of piety and virtue visible in all classes of the population. With few exceptions the kings were loyal to Jahweh, and many of them evinced both character and wisdom. They were aided and corrected by the priesthood. The bulk of the country people were on the same side. We can trace in public measures the growth and refinement of the moral sense. Rude customs were abolished and reforms effected. Religion was organized and the Law was codified. We perceive the increase, if not the first appearance, of a literature of patriotism and religious faith, breathing a strong confidence of the future. The Temple, though avoided by the great majority of the Tribes and ignored by the main currents of prophecy which ran in the Northern Kingdom, steadily grew in the regard of the Judæan people and in the influence of the priesthood. It is true that down to Ahaz the supremacy of the King was maintained over both the administration and the ritual of the Temple; but the argument is false, that therefore the Temple was little more than the Chapel Royal. Its very proximity to the Palace meant the training of its priests in public affairs; and they undoubtedly played in politics and religion a part analogous to that of the more famous prophets of the North. Several episodes in the history prove the increasing popularity of the Temple and the consequent growth both of its revenues and of its spiritual influence. The people of the land gathered to it; its treasures, though often exhausted, were always again sufficient for national emergen-

By Athaliah.

cies. If not the only, it was regarded as the chief sanctuary of Jahweh in Judah: it was not merely the royal but the national and the popular shrine. To all this we have to add, at least from Uzziah onwards, the development of the trade of the City and the increase of her military strength. The walls which fell before Joash of Israel were so fortified by Uzziah and Jotham that they resisted not only the confederate troops of Israel and Aram, but after Hezekiah's additions to them, the arms of Assyria.

Such was the Jerusalem in which Isaiah grew up. The vision which he gives of her is twofold, actual and ideal. On both sides it confirms that story of her growth from Rehoboam to Hezekiah, which we have read from the annals of Judah.

I.

First, then, we find portrayed, as by one who, for forty years at least, walked the pavements of Jerusalem and watched her from his housetop, line after line of her material features, and phase after phase of her crowded life.

We get not a few glimpses of her position and shape—*Mount Sion and the hill of Jerusalem*,¹ so described for the first time; of fragments of her architecture and engineering—the *conduit of the Upper Pool on the highway of the Fuller's Field*,² the *Shilloah*, and its *softly flowing waters*,³ the *armour in the Forest-house*,⁴ the *waters of the Lower Pool*, and the *tank between the two walls for the water of the Old Pool*⁵; of the lines of wall,⁶ the *Temple-Courts*,⁷ and the *house-tops*,⁸ at all times in this city of covered

¹ x. 12 (?) 32; xxxi. 4. ² vii. 3.

³ viii. 6. ⁴ xxii. 8.

⁵ xxii. 9, 11; but it is uncertain whether these verses are of Isaiah's date.

⁶ xxxvi. 11. ⁷ i. 11 ff. ⁸ xxii. 1.

lanes the only stages on which crowds were visible; of the *lifted* look of the new buildings¹; and of the *carven sepulchres on high*,² the like of which are still so conspicuous round the City. The environing hills stand clear; Nob is named upon them, and behind Nob the train of villages up the great North Road.³ There are also the *wadies between precipices and the clefts of the rocks*,⁴ so characteristic of the immediate surroundings of the City; *the standing wheat* in the Vale of Rephaim⁵; and the whole background of pasture and agriculture, vineyards and olive groves, with large trees scattered across it, terebinths and oaks.⁶

We see, too, by Isaiah's eyes the habits and fashions of the citizens. The various religions are visible: on the one side the Temple-courts, thronged with worshippers, and above them the smoke of the lavish sacrifices,⁷ the new moons and the Sabbaths; on the other heathen rites and magic, the many idols and soothsayers,⁸ the necromancy and spirit-raising,⁹ the Adonis gardens and the worship of trees.¹⁰ We see a great deal of luxury and vice; the parade and foppery of the women,¹¹ and, in verses which Juvenal might have written of the Romans of his day, the drunkenness in the streets and at the banquets: *priest and prophet reel with new wine, and totter while giving judgment; all tables are covered with vomit, filth everywhere*.¹² The rulers are childish and effeminate; the judges are corrupt; the poor are oppressed; tyranny in high places and insolence among the young and the mean.¹³ Through all this, we

¹ ii. 12, 15.² xxii. 16.³ x. 28 ff.⁴ vii. 19.⁵ xvii. 5.⁶ v. 1-6; 8-10; vi. 13; vii. 18 ff.; xvii. 6; i. 29-30; xxviii. 23 ff. (though Cheyne and others deny this passage to Isaiah); xviii. 4 ff.; i. 8.⁷ i. 11.⁸ ii. 6, 8, 18, etc.⁹ viii. 19: the objections to the authenticity of these verses are not cogent.¹⁰ xvii. 10 f.; i. 29 f.¹¹ iii. 16 ff.¹² xxviii. 7 f.; cf. v. 11 f.¹³ Ch. i. iii. and v.

see the prophet himself moving austere, clamant, persistent: confronting the king at the end of the conduit¹; displaying a large tablet with plain characters²; leading about his children with the ominous names³; walking for three years through the streets stripped of his upper robe and barefoot.⁴ In short we have seen nothing of Jerusalem so near or so vivid since the days of David.

Most significant for the history of the City are the noise and movement everywhere audible round the prophet. The land has become full of silver and gold, full of horses and chariots.⁵ There are strong foreign elements⁶; and other prophets of the time emphasize the increase of trade and building. All this must have found its focus in Jerusalem, *her pomp, her throng, her tumult, and the joyful in her*⁷; while the rural districts, under the new economic conditions, were being stripped of their people and their wealth.⁸ Isaiah prophesies in presence of the characteristic tempers of a large city-life: the religion of crowds,⁹ their fickleness and desperate levity—

*What has come to thee, then, that the whole of thee is up on the house-tops,
O full of uproar, city tumultuous, jubilant town!
The Lord, Jahweh Sebaöth, was calling on that day
To tears, lamentation, baldness, girding with sack-cloth;
And lo, there is joyaunce, merriment, slaying of oxen, killing of
sheep,
Eating of flesh and drinking of wine;
Eating and drinking for—"To-morrow we die,"*¹⁰

In this connexion we must notice how Isaiah mentions Jerusalem as parallel to the rest of Judah—the Lord removes from Jerusalem and from Judah every stay and support;

¹ vii. 3 ff.² viii. 1, 6 ff.³ vii. 3; viii. 3 ff.; 18.⁴ xx. 1 ff.⁵ ii. 7 ff.⁶ ii. 6; cf. Shebna, the secretary with the Aramaic name.⁷ v. 14.⁸ v. 8 ff.; cf. Micah ii. 2.⁹ i. 11 ff.¹⁰ xxii. 1, 12 f. (probably in 701); יִשְׂרָאֵל, *jubilant* (cf. ii. 14), is also used of Jerusalem by Zephaniah, ii. 15.

*Jerusalem comes to ruin and Judah falls*¹; *ye dwellers in Jerusalem and men of Judah*,² and as parallel even to both houses of Israel.³ Already is the capital approaching that preponderance of influence which in coming centuries is to render the rest of the country but the fringe on her walls. Nothing could better confirm the fact of her growth during the previous period: the change which the development of trade, the new economic conditions alluded to above, and the increasing importance of her Temple had made in her relation to the rest of the land.

II.

But all these visions of the material size, strength, and noise of the City, vivid and near as they be, are dim beside the burning words in which Isaiah reveals her moral and her religious significance. From such words we receive ample confirmation of the evidence we have gathered of Jerusalem's ethical advancement in the age of the Double Kingdom. Her present vice and corruption of justice does not prevent Isaiah from affirming that she had been *the faithful city, full of justice, where righteousness abode*.⁴ The Lord had made *a vineyard on a fruitful and sunny hill. He had dug it and cleared it of stones, planted choice vines in it, built a tower in the midst, hewed a vine-vat and looked to find grapes that were good*—such is the prophet's account of the centuries leading up to his own.⁵ The outcome ought to have been justice and righteousness, but behold it was *bloodshed and screaming*.⁶ Nevertheless He has still His purposes with her: He has not Himself forsaken her. *The Lord hath founded Sion*.⁷ She is Ariel, *God's altar-hearth*,⁸ *who has a fire in Sion and a furnace in*

¹ iii. 1, 8.

² v. 3.

³ viii. 11.

⁴ i. 21.

⁵ v. 1 ff.

⁶ v. 7.

⁷ xiv. 32 (721?).

⁸ xxix. 1 (probably about 704).

*Jerusalem.*¹ *He dwells in Sion.*² Therefore, even before Samaria fell, and Jerusalem was left without a rival, and even before her vindication in 701 as Jahweh's inviolate shrine, the City was identified by Isaiah with the One True God and with His religion.

It is not wonderful, therefore, that from the beginning of his career the prophet should have beheld Jerusalem in a supernatural glory. This breaks even upon his inaugural vision. The actual temple is indeed its stage; the walls raised by Solomon and repaired by Joash. But they give way before his eyes, and open upon the Divine court itself and the immediate presence of the Lord. The foundations of the thresholds rock at the thunderous song of the seraphim, and through the smoke a seraph flies with a glowing stone to the prophet's lips. Nor does Isaiah fail to see the city herself and the land in the same or a similar apocalypse. In one of the very earliest of his discourses he describes *the terror of Jahweh, and the glory of His majesty, when He rises to strike once through the land. In that day shall Jahweh—Him whom he had seen on a throne high and lifted up—be alone exalted.*³ *The Lord shall cleanse the filth of the daughters of Sion, and sweep from her midst the blood of Jerusalem by a spirit of judgment and a spirit of burning.*⁴ There is a vision of Sheol enlarging her appetite and opening her mouth without measure, and of Sion's pomp and throng and tumult and jubilation plunging into it.⁵ *The day of Jahweh is the overthrow of all that is high.*⁶ Behold there will be distress

¹ xxxi. 9: unless, as some think, this is a later addition to Isaiah's prophecies.

² viii. 18. Cheyne dates this oracle as late as 701, but with a mark of interrogation. It is probably earlier.

³ ii. 10, 11, 17, 19 (under Ahaz).

⁴ iv. 4 (under Ahaz: but denied by some to Isaiah and his times).

⁵ v. 14 (under Ahaz).

⁶ ii. 11 f.

*and darkness, the gloom of anguish and pitch darkness.*¹ *Suddenly shall he be visited of Jahweh of Hosts with thunder and with earthquake and a great noise, with whirlwind and storm and flame of devouring fire.*² Now these visions are not apocalypse technically so-called, the beginnings of which in prophecy we are wont to trace to Zephaniah. But they travel in that direction, with a desire for the manifestation of God, and a conviction of the fulness of His judgment, which the material of this dispensation cannot satisfy, and which look to the hidden world for their fulfilment. Occurring as some of the visions do in discourses, unanimously attributed to Isaiah's earlier years, they arrest us from following the recent tendency of criticism to deny to the prophet a number of other passages³ on the ground that these must be the product of a later age more at home in apocalyptic vision. The verses just quoted prove that the young Isaiah knew how to paint pictures of the Divine presence and judgment with colours from another world and atmosphere than our own. But however we may settle that point of literary criticism, what is at present of interest to us, is that to Isaiah on the threshold of his career Jerusalem had already that supreme ethical and religious significance, out of his conviction of which alone he could see her singularly bare and unromantic site enveloped in the glories and terrors of the Divine presence.

To this, her religious significance, is due the cardinal place which Isaiah claimed for a city so aloof and so unendowed by nature, in the politics and history of the world. Isaiah was the first to set Jerusalem on high among the nations; nor had the conditions for such an exaltation been present before his day. What first gave

¹ viii. 22 (under Ahaz).

² xxix. 6 (circa 703 B.C.).

³ e.g. iv. 2 ff.; v. 30; xxix. 5, 7 f.; xxx. 27 f. etc.

the mind of Israel the opportunity of realizing the world as a whole was the advance of the Assyrian Empire and its reduction of the peoples under its sway.¹ The religion of Israel rose to the opportunity. The God whom its prophets saw *exalted in righteousness* could not but be supreme over the novel world-wide forces which had risen upon history. His old national name, *Jahweh Sebaōth*, meant no more Jahweh of the armies of Israel, but Lord of the great powers. Assyria was but the tempest in His hand,² *the rod of His anger and the staff of His indignation*.³ When He had done with it, He should *break it on His own land, and tread it under foot upon His mountains*.⁴ But of these movements of history what could be the centre but the city where God had set His hearth and His dwelling, and where He had provided *a refuge for the afflicted of His people*?⁵ Jerusalem was inviolable whether against the confederacy of Aram and Israel,⁶ or against the Assyrian invasion itself.⁷ God was with her,⁸ and would save her by His own arm and in His own way. This was the conviction which sustained Isaiah in his predictions that Jerusalem could not be taken. It was independent of her material strength. But of course the latter with the city's withdrawn and exalted site, afforded that earthly basis which every such spiritual conviction needs for its realization in history. Without her hills and her walls Jerusalem could not have existed at all, nor Isaiah himself have had ground whereon to stand and answer her enemies

¹ Cf. the present writer's *Book of the Twelve Prophets*, I., ch. iv., "The Influence of Assyria upon Prophecy,"

² Isa. xxviii. 2.

³ x. 5. See Cheyne's reading in *S.B.O.T.*

⁴ xiv. 25.

⁵ xiv. 32.

⁶ vii. 4 ff.

⁷ x. 28 ff. (there is no valid objection against the authenticity of verses 33, 34); xiv. 29-32.

⁸ vii. 14; viii. 8, 10. The occurrence of the phrase in these last two verses is denied to Isaiah by Cheyne and others.

as he did in the name of God. So that even Uzziah's and Hezekiah's fortifications were part of the preparation for the prophet and for his vindication of his city as inviolable.

Of the characteristics of Jerusalem, developed from David's time onward and used or enhanced by Isaiah, we have now only to deal with her relation to David's dynasty. How did Isaiah treat this? Or did he touch upon it at all? The latter question is rendered necessary by the recent criticism of Hackmann, Cheyne, Volz and Marti, who partly on grounds of language, but largely on the theory that all prophecies of the Messiah are late, have denied to Isaiah those passages¹ in which he proclaims the advent of a victorious Leader and Ruler of Israel, a scion of the house of David. The present writer has already argued against their conclusions,² and here need only add that the reasons against the authenticity of the passages given by Marti in his recent Commentary³ do not seem to him any more cogent than those of the others. It is not conclusive to say that Isaiah laboured only for the preservation of a religious community, while the promised Prince's functions are described as purely political, or that his expectation of the appearance of God Himself leaves no room for the rise of so imposing a figure. Isaiah as strenuously laboured for the continuance of the Jewish state as for the security of Jerusalem. He lamented the corruption of justice and the imbecility into which under Ahaz the government had fallen. No need of the time was more urgent than that of a wise and righteous prince; if, as Isaiah predicted, invasion and devastation were imminent on the land, it would not be unnatural to paint him as a victorious captain as well. But where was such an one to be found outside the House of David, which in Judah had no rival, and had already, when almost extirpated, proved its powers of recuperation?

¹ Ch. ix. and xi. ² Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, art. "Isaiah."

³ In the *Kurzer Hand-Kommentar*.

Thus all the moral and political conditions were present for such prophecies as we are now discussing. For him who took the popular idea of a coming day of the Lord and transformed it into a purely ethical conception, it was equally natural to choose some common hope of the advent of a powerful prince, and to give it those moral elements with which the popular religion was incapable of endowing it. To say that Isaiah "set his hope on Jahweh and upon a religious community, but not upon the Davidic dynasty and a political dominion,"¹ is to detach the prophet—who was a statesman as well—from those political conditions of his age along which we elsewhere find him working for the future. That Isaiah should invest his hope in the recovery and continuance of the Dynasty need give us no more difficulty than the fact (which is not doubted) of his insisting upon the survival of the City. We may feel even less difficulty with the military features which he has introduced into his proclamation of the Prince of the Four Names. The title *Father of Spoil*—if that be indeed the correct rendering—is overborne by the others; while the overthrow of Israel's enemies associated with his advent,² is as directly imputed to God as it is in the unquestioned oracles of Isaiah.³ We need not doubt, therefore, Isaiah's authorship of chapters ix. 2-7 and xi. 1-8.

Thus, then, we see the fires which David and Solomon kindled in Jerusalem, and which have been smouldering—sometimes one might say without betraying anything but smoke—leap into high, bright flames at the powerful breath of Isaiah. The City has found her Prophet: the mind to read her history and proclaim her destiny. Her long labours and obscure growth from Rehoboam to Hezekiah have received their vision and interpretation. Without that history behind him, Isaiah could not have spoken as he did of the character and destiny of Jerusalem. But he was the

¹ Marti, p. 94 f. ² ix. 4. ³ e.g. xiv. 24 f.

first to read and to proclaim their full meaning ; and therefore Jerusalem may be said to be Isaiah's Jerusalem, just as much as she was David's or Solomon's.

III.

We have now to follow Isaiah, as with these convictions about the City he carried her—it would appear almost unaided—through the great crises which fell upon her during the reign of Hezekiah.

When Hezekiah came to the throne remains uncertain, 729, 721 or 715 ; as also, when he died, soon after 701 or about 692, or even as late as 685. But the discussion of the exact dates is not necessary to our present purpose. What is clear is that Hezekiah had already reigned some years before the campaign of Sennacherib in 701 ; and if the second attempt of Sennacherib on Jerusalem, described in Isaiah xxxvi., xxxvii. is to be put as late as 690 or thereabouts, Hezekiah was then still on the throne.

In 721 Samaria fell, the Northern Kingdom came to its end, and its people were carried into exile. Judah therefore remained the sole trustee of the hope of Israel, and the Temple was left without a possible rival. What emphasis this gave to Isaiah's earlier words about the City and Mount Sion need not be detailed. But it may be noted that in addition (as some have rightly conjectured) the fall of the Northern State would lead to the immigration of a number of fugitives to Jerusalem, as well as to the occasional pilgrimages of such of the Israelite population as remained in the land of Samaria.

In the same year Merodach Baladan, chief of a small Chaldean state at the head of the Persian Gulf, became King of Babylon, in revolt from Assyria, and maintained his position till 710. Somewhere between these dates, therefore, we must place his embassy to Hezekiah¹ : many

¹ Isaiah xxxix. 1-8.

date it immediately after Merodach Baladan's accession,¹ and suppose it to have been connected with the revolts against Assyria by the North-Syrian states, Gaza and the Arabian Muşri. These were subdued by Sargon. Hezekiah does not appear to have taken part in them. For nearly a decade no further rising was attempted in Palestine. But the power, or at least the pretensions of Egypt were growing, and like other Syrian states Judah developed a party sympathetic to her. With the Philistine cities Edom and Moab, Hezekiah seems to have formed a coalition. It was at least as a warning against such a policy that Isaiah received the Divine command to walk unrobed and barefoot for three years: for Jahweh said, *As my servant Isaiah hath walked unrobed and barefoot three years for a sign and a portent against Egypt and Ethiopia,*² *so shall the kingdom of Assyria lead away the captives of Egypt and the exiles of Ethiopia stripped and barefoot to the shame of Egypt . . . And the inhabitants of the coastland shall say in that day: Lo, such is our expectation, whither we had fled for help to deliver ourselves from the king of Assyria, and how shall we escape?* The warning was effectual. Ashdod alone revolted, in 711, and was easily subdued by the Assyrian Tartan.

No further attempt against Assyria was made till the death of Sargon and the accession of Sennacherib in 705. Then, or soon after, a wider coalition of the Palestine states was formed, not wholly on their own strength, but with hope of support from Egypt. It is significant of the growing reputation of Jerusalem that in this coalition Hezekiah seems to have played a leading rôle. The Egyptian party in his Court ruled its politics, and Isaiah's oracles at the time describe their temper. He has no word now of idols,

¹ Winckler, *A.T. Untersuchungen*.

² Winckler and others take these to have been the Arabian Muşri and Kush.

he implies that the people worship Jahweh; yet their religion is purely formal, a *precept of men learned by rote*.¹ They have rejected the spiritual teaching of the prophet; and are trusting on embassies to Egypt, on her promises, and her gifts of horses and chariots, expected or actually received.² They appear also to have sought assistance in other quarters. In the narrative of his advance on Jerusalem Sennacherib says that Hezekiah had reinforced his garrison with Arabian mercenaries; and it is the account of an embassy to Arabia which some recent critics find underlying the present form of the *Oracle on the Beasts of the South*.³

To the same years we may assign Hezekiah's work on the fortifications of Jerusalem, though some of this was so extensive that it was perhaps carried out in the earlier and less strained years of his reign. According to the Deuteronomic Editor of the Books of Kings, the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah held an account of a new pool and a conduit by which Hezekiah brought the waters within the City.⁴ The Chronicler says that *Hezekiah sealed the issue of the waters of Gihon, the upper, and led them down, westwards, to the City of David*.⁵ In another passage he explains the King's purpose, *Much people were gathered, and they sealed all the springs and the Nahal, or brook, flowing through the midst of the land, saying, why should the Kings of Assyria come and find much water?*⁶ The Chronicler evidently describes the same work as that referred to by the Editor of Kings: and there can be no doubt that he understood by it the tunnel which runs under Ophel from the Virgin's Well, or Gihon,⁷ and carries the waters of the latter to the Pool of Siloam. Whether he only inferred this to have been the conduit which Heze-

¹ xxix. 13 (about 703 B.C.). ² xxx. 1 ff., 12, 16; xxxi. 1.

³ xxx. 6 ff.

⁴ 2 Kings xx. 20. ⁵ 2 Chron. xxxii. 30. ⁶ Id. 4.

⁷ See EXPOSITOR for 1903 (Jan.-June), pp. 223 ff.

kiah made or found a statement of the fact in the official annals of Judah does not matter much. The characters of the inscription in the Tunnel cannot be later than the time of Hezekiah; and the inscription speaks of the *issue*, named by the Chronicler as *Gihon, the upper*, and of the *pool* mentioned in 2 Kings xx. 20. We may therefore pretty confidently assume that the Tunnel is *the conduit* by which Hezekiah *brought the waters into the City*. In that case the Shilloah mentioned by Isaiah in the reign of Ahaz was another conduit by which they were still led outside the walls of Ophel: perhaps the channel partly cut in the rock and partly built, which Messrs. Hornstein and Masterman have traced from Gihon southwards.¹ Hezekiah's purpose was very practical. The main difficulty with which besiegers of Jerusalem have had to contend—and it has sometimes proved insuperable—is the waterlessness of the City's surroundings. Gihon was the only fountain of the neighbourhood, and it sprang just outside the city walls. By covering the aperture of the cave in which it issued and by leading its waters under the City of David to a reservoir in the mouth of the central ravine between Ophel and the South-western Hill, Hezekiah deprived the invader of its use and secured this for himself. But the formation of a pool where the Tunnel issues in the central ravine furnishes us with unambiguous evidence of the extension of Jerusalem over the South-western Hill. We have seen that part of this was probably covered with buildings under David and Solomon, and perhaps enclosed with walls. But what was only probable under these monarchs is now seen to be certain under Hezekiah. His purpose of securing the waters of Gihon for the besieged by bringing them to a pool in the central ravine could not have been effected unless he held at the same time the South-western Hill. This rises immediately

¹ See EXPOSITOR 1903 (Jan.-June), p. 216.

from the Pool at the end of the Tunnel, and if it had been outside the City and unfortified, a blockading force could, easily with their darts and stones have prevented the besieged from using the Pool. We may confidently assert, then, that Isaiah's Jerusalem included the South-western Hill, that this was surrounded by walls and contained some of the lofty buildings which he describes.

The Chronicler adds that *Hezekiah built again all the wall which had been breached, and raised upon it towers, and outside another wall.*¹ If the wall which had been breached refers to some definite part of the walls of the City, it can only be the northern wall breached by Joash and repaired by Uzziah²; in that case Hezekiah further strengthened this most vulnerable part of the fortifications, and *the other wall without* it was also on the North, enclosing some new suburb sprung up there in the prosperous times of Uzziah and Jotham. But the phrase *the wall which had been breached* may bear a more general signification, as of all the fortifications wherever they were in disrepair. Dr. Bliss is inclined to see *the two walls with a ditch between them*, mentioned in Isaiah xxii. 11, in two lines of wall uncovered by him in the mouth of the Tyropoeon: one running up the edge of the South-western Hill on the west of the two pools of Siloam, the other crossing the valley below them so as to shut them in. The first, he says, may have been in use before Hezekiah, the second may have been thrown by Hezekiah across the mouth of the valley with the view of protecting the new Pool.³ But all this is uncertain, even so far as Isaiah xxii. 11 alone is concerned; nor can we be sure that the two walls mentioned there are the same two as given in 2 Chron. xxxii. 5.

¹ 2 Chronicles xxxii. 5, reading וַיִּבְנֶה עֲלֶיהָ מִגְדָּלוֹת for וַיִּבְנֶה עָלֶיהָ מִגְדָּלוֹת; the LXX. omits the letters יַעַל עָלֶיהָ.

² 2 Kings xiv. 13: 2 Chronicles xxvi. 9.

³ *Excavations at Jerusalem* 1891-1897, pp. 325 f.

The Chronicler also tells us that Hezekiah *strengthened the Millo*, to which a later hand has added the words, *City of David*.¹

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

THE STUDY OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS
EXEMPLIFIED BY MATTHEW V. 21, 22.

IN studying the Synoptic Gospels it is customary to take the Greek text and use in connexion with it such indispensable aids as Bruder, Bengel, Winer, Liddell and Scott, etc., etc., and to claim in this way to be studying the "original." It is, however, quite certain that, in the first place, as to many actual words, knowledge of Greek is insufficient for understanding them; some examples occur in the passage Matthew v. 21, 22: ἡ κρίσις (in the particular sense here used), ῥακά, συνέδριον, μωρέ, and the phrase ἡ γέενα τοῦ πυρός; and, in the second place, the mental atmosphere, the method of expression and general lines of thought are such as to be incapable of adequate appreciation if Greek, and Greek alone, is to be the guide; examples of this may be had in many of the parables.² It is too frequently sought to elucidate the parables by means of all kinds of analogies, some quite irrelevant, whereas the only method which can really get at the truth is that which aims at getting at the speaker's mind; but seeing that Christ did not address his hearers in Greek, that His medium of thought and method of expression lay right away from Greek,³ it must be obvious, that for a real understanding of His words and teaching, one must

¹ 2 Chronicles xxxii. 5: *The Millo*; LXX. τὸ ἀνάλημα.

² Cf. e.g. *The Parable of the Unjust Steward*, in the *EXPOSITOR*, April 1903.

³ No opinion is here hazarded as to whether Christ knew Greek or not, the point insisted on being only that He taught His own people in their native language.

endeavour to find out first, whenever possible, what actual words He used, His method of expressing thought, His method of teaching, and the special conditions and circumstances of His time. For this, it is maintained, the Greek Testament, though of course occupying the foremost place, is insufficient; for the Greek text is not the original. In studying the Synoptic Gospels, therefore, in a really scientific way, such as the advanced knowledge of our time seems to demand, the method should be (besides the use of the Greek text) somewhat upon the following lines:—

I.

It is of great importance that the Septuagint should be used, and this not only when the Old Testament is quoted in the Gospels, but also whenever a single word is found to be common to both.¹ The linguistic influence of the Septuagint upon the whole of the New Testament is very marked. In the Synoptic Gospels the Old Testament is quoted directly seventy-six times; in the great majority of cases the passages quoted from the Old Testament are in general agreement with the Septuagint. But these direct quotations are very far from exhausting the extent of the influence of the Septuagint upon the Gospels and the New Testament generally, for there are almost innumerable references of a less formal character. Dr. Swete says: "The careful student of the Gospels and S. Paul is met at every turn by words and phrases which cannot be fully understood without reference to their earlier use in the Greek Old Testament."² Then we must remember the origin of the Septuagint; as a version of the Hebrew Scriptures, it is obviously impregnated with Hebrew expressions and Hebrew methods of thought. While not forgetting

¹ Too much stress cannot be laid, in this connexion, on the importance of using also Deissmann's *Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1895, and *Neue Bibelstudien*, 1897.

² *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, p. 404.

that the Septuagint is to a great extent written in the special Alexandrian dialect (ἡ Ἀλεξανδρίων διάλεκτος), one must lay stress on the *Semitic* character of its diction and mental environment; this is conclusively shown by Dr. Swete in contrasting some passages of the Greek Bible with the corresponding contexts in the *Antiquities* of Josephus. In comparing the two one passes "from a literal translation of Semitic texts to an imitation of classical Greek. But," continues Dr. Swete, "the contrast is not entirely due to the circumstance that the passages taken from the Septuagint are translations, while the *Antiquities* is an original work. Translations, however faithful, may be in the manner of the language into which they render their original. But the manner of the Septuagint is not Greek, and does not even aim at being so. It is that of a book written by men of Semitic descent, who have carried their habits of thought into their adopted tongue. The translators write Greek largely as they doubtless spoke it; they possess a plentiful vocabulary and are at no loss for a word, but they are almost indifferent to idiom, and seem to have no sense of rhythm. Hebrew constructions and Semitic arrangements of the words are at times employed even when not directly suggested by the original."¹ One sees, therefore, that through the Septuagint, the Synoptic Gospels are impregnated with the Hebrew genius, and that for this reason, if for no other, it is necessary to read the Hebrew underlying the Septuagint, if the Synoptic Gospels are to be studied adequately.

II.

That the original words of Christ were spoken in the Aramaic dialect now known as "Jewish-Palestinian" can scarcely be questioned. This dialect is very closely allied

¹ Ibid. pp. 298, 299; cf. pp. 306 ff.

with "Christian-Palestinian"¹; both, of course, belong to the Aramaic language. Christian-Palestinian Aramaic is connected in the closest manner with the language of the Targumim, the Midrashim, and the Jerusalem Talmud; Jewish-Palestinian Aramaic is the language of the Mishna and the Baraitas.² The point of special importance in the present connexion with regard to these dialects is that they contain many actual Hebrew words, of which some even have remained unmodified by the ordinary rules of Aramaic vocalisation. Nöldeke, who is perhaps the greatest authority on the subject, says: "The great mass of Aramaic-speaking Christians in Palestine assuredly issued from the Jewish population; we must see in them the direct descendants of the עַמִּי הָאָרֶץ ("people of the land"), who embraced the new religion. Among these, just as in the case of the Samaritans, we may assume the existence of remains of the ancient national language, even though this had been supplanted for centuries; these remains they took over with them when they embraced Christianity."³

It follows that in our study of the Synoptic Gospels recourse must be had, when possible, to these various Semitic dialects; and there can be no shadow of doubt that much new light is shed on words and passages by doing so. A few examples may be given⁴:—

Luke xv. 15: ἐκολλήθη, "joined himself"; the Greek word implies permanent union (κόλλα, "glue"), which is inappropriate in this passage. In Christian-Palestinian Aramaic the word used is אַתְרַבַּךְ, which means simply "to follow," (ἀκολουθεῖν).

¹ This generally-accepted term was first applied by Nöldeke.

² Jacob, *Das hebräische Sprachgut im Christlich-Palästinischen* in ZATW, 1902, pp. 83 ff.

³ ZDMG, xxii. pp. 113 ff.

⁴ I am indebted for these words to Jacob (and follow him in writing the Aramaic words in Hebrew letters, though in their original form they are written in Syriac characters), and to Schwally, *Idioticon*.

Mark ii. 9: τί ἐστὶν εὐκοπώτερον, "whether is easier"; Chr.-Pal. Aram. כִּיָּא נִיח, which contains the idea of "rest" (root נוח), and might be literally translated: "Which is more restful"; it is quite conceivable that the words in the original contained a covert contrast, regarding what was about to happen, between the lying down upon the bed and the taking of it up and walking.

Luke vii. 2: ἤμελλεν τελευτᾶν: "was at the point of death"; in the original the expression is even more graphic, עבר דיכּוּת, lit.: "he was passing over to die," i.e. he was crossing the border-line.

Matt. xix. 30: ἔσχατοι: "last"; Chr.-Pal. Aram. עקב; this comes from the same root as the word for "heel," and can thus have also the meaning of "supplanter"; this would make the passage in question still more significant; the story of Esau and Jacob, which involuntarily rises to the mind, is certainly a pointed comment on the passage.

Luke vii. 38: ἀλάβαστρον: "an alabaster cruise"; the Chr.-Pal. Aram. צִלּוּחִיתָא means simply a "bottle" or "flask," and has nothing to do with alabaster; this is recognized in the R.V. margin.¹ The Greek expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is, as Dalman says, only a makeshift ("ein Produkt schlimmer Verlegenheit"). The study of this expression in its various Semitic forms is of the greatest interest, and very important; in the special form and meaning in which it must have been used by our Lord (בֶּר אֱנִשָּׂא) it was new, never occurring in the earlier literature²; indeed, the other allied forms that occur could not be translated "Son of Man" any more than the Greek ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου can be; strictly speaking, the only form of which "the Son of Man" is the real equivalent is just this Jewish-Palestinian (Dalman, "Jewish-

¹ Numbers of other words could be given; for these see the Literature given below.

² Regarding כֶּבֶר אֱנִשָּׂא in Dan. vii. 13, see *Die Worte Jesu* p. 193.

Galilaean'') expression **בֵּר אֱנִשָּׁא** and its Chr.-Pal. form **בֵּר נִשָּׂא**. But for an adequate discussion of this subject recourse must be had to Dalman's *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 191-197.

These are but a very few examples, but they point to the fact that there are many words and expressions in the Synoptic Gospels whose real meaning is not obtainable from the Greek text. Scarcely anything has been said about underlying ideas, which so often cannot be reproduced in a translation; but to consider examples of these would take us too far afield. It will readily be understood that if isolated words and expressions in the Greek text can be elucidated by the use of what one feels must have been the original, much more will this be the case when *conceptions* are dealt with. What a vast amount of new light is shed upon the Gospel conceptions by this method of studying them, can be seen, for example, in using Dalman's book just quoted.¹

III.

Besides using the Septuagint, with the underlying Hebrew, and such material of Jewish- and Christian-Palestinian Aramaic as is available, it goes without saying that the Syriac versions should be studied. It is true, they are translations from the Greek; but apart from the fact that one of them represents a Greek text some two hundred years older than our earliest Greek codices, and is therefore quite invaluable from a text-critical point of view,²—they take us into a Semitic atmosphere, and, from what has been said above, this is a matter of importance. Lastly, it is much to be recommended that the Gospels be read in Hebrew; the Semitic atmosphere of the Synoptic Gospels is vividly brought out in doing this.

¹ Other Literature to be used for this purpose is given below.

² Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, p. 78; of the Curetonian Syriac and the Sinai Syriac Mr. Burkitt so truly says that they are "inestimably precious, as relics of the time before the Syriac-speaking Church became the servile imitator of Greek Christianity." p. 66.

It may be not inappropriate to mention here some of the works which will be found valuable in seeking to study the Gospels on the lines briefly indicated. It will be understood that the following list is very far from professing to be in any way exhaustive.

i. Of the large number of works dealing with the relationship between the Old and New Testaments one may select : Swete's *Gospel according to S. Mark*, pp. lxx. ff. (London, 1898); the same writer's *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, pp. 381-405, 433-461 (Cambridge, 1900); Dittmar's *Vetus Testamentum in Novo*, pp. 1-108 (Göttingen, 1903); but what is really wanted here is that Gospel words and phrases should be studied in the light of the Septuagint text with the aid of Hatch and Redpath's Concordance.

ii. For the Aramaic dialects the following selection of books and articles will be found of great help: *Idioticon des Christlich-palästinischen Aramäisch* (Giessen, 1893), Schwally; *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch* (Leipzig, 1894), Dalman; *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der aramäischen Dialecte. II. Ueber den christlich-palästinischen Dialect*, (ZDMG, xxii. pp. 443 ff.), Nöldeke; *Anecdota Oxoniensia* (Semitic Series), i. 5 (Oxford, 1893), Gwilliam; *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary, with Glossary* (Cambridge, 1897), Lewis, Nestle and Gibson; *The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels* (London, 1899), Lewis and Gibson; *Das hebräische Sprachgut im Christlich-Palästinischen* (ZATW, xxii. pp. 90 ff.), see also ZDMG, lv. pp. 140 ff., Jacob; *Remarkable Readings in the Epistles found in the Pal. Syr. Lectionary* (JTS, v. pp. 437 ff.), Marshall; and the reply to this by Burkitt (vi. pp. 91 ff.); see also the bibliography given by Burkitt in JTS, ii pp. 174 ff.

iii. For the Old Syriac, Burkitt's *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* (Cambridge, 1904); for the Hebrew N.T. Delitzsch-

Dalman, ספרי הברית החדשה (Berlin, 1904). Besides these there are three works of supreme importance, all indispensable for the study of the Synoptic Gospels; two have already been referred to, viz. *Die Worte Jesu* (Leipzig, 1898) by Dalman, and *Bibelstudien* (Marburg, 1895), *Neue Bibelstudien* (Marburg, 1897) by Deissmann; these have been translated into English. Then there is, lastly, Weber's *Jüdische Theologie* (Leipzig, 1897), of which it is impossible to speak too highly; it is the result of many years' study of post-biblical Jewish literature, and the impression left on one's mind after its study is expressed in the words, "How can one understand the Gospels properly without this?"

IV.

There is one other point which must be briefly touched upon, viz. : Is there any reason to suppose that there ever existed, in written form, any portion of the Gospel narrative in the original Jewish-Palestinian or allied dialect of Aramaic? It should be stated at the outset that the theory of a Hebrew original of which any of our present Synoptic Gospels is a translation is untenable. At the same time, there are certain facts which undoubtedly point to one or more of the *sources* from which the compilers of the Synoptic Gospels drew their material having been a Hebrew document, or one written in some allied language, very possibly both.

i. In the first place, it is what might be expected in the natural order of things. The earliest attempt to preserve in permanent form the teaching of Christ would naturally have been written either in the language in which it was originally spoken, or else, that teaching having been based on the Hebrew Scriptures, and having regard to the reverence in which the language of these Scriptures was held (לשון הקודש, "the holy tongue"), it would have been preserved in Hebrew.

ii. Secondly, there are distinct indications in the Synoptic Gospels themselves that some portions of them must have been translated from Hebrew, for example, the "Magnificat," the "Benedictus," and the "Nunc Dimittis." Again, the form and diction of the first two chapters of Matthew almost compel one to look for a language other than Greek as their original.¹ It has, too, been rightly pointed out that "the significance of the allusion to the dictum of the prophets, 'He shall be called a Nazarene' (Matt. ii. 23), can only be elucidated by reference to the Hebrew messianic terms *nēṣār* (נֶצֶר); *ṣemah* (צֶמַח), *nāzir* (נָזִיר); in the Septuagint equivalents the indispensable assonance is lost."² Then, again, in the words, "thou shalt call his name *Jesus*; for it is he that shall *save* his people from their sins" (i. 21), there is a play upon the words "Jesus" and "save," which points to a Hebrew (not Aramaic) original (יֵשׁוּעַ יוֹשִׁיעַ). Both these verses were clearly written for Hebrew readers.

iii. Thirdly, we have the following direct evidence. Papias, or rather the "presbyter" from whom he derived his information (making the date of the evidence somewhat earlier), tells us that "Matthew then compiled the Discourses [of the Lord] (τὰ [κυριακὰ] λόγια) in the Hebrew tongue, and everyone translated them as he was able." It is quite possible that this "Hebrew" may have been Aramaic; there is no evidence to show that the "presbyter" was able to discriminate. Again, S. Jerome, in the course of his biblical studies, "had become aware of the existence of an Aramaic Gospel, written in Hebrew characters, which was preserved and used by the Christians of the Syrian Berœa. At a later date he found a second copy of the same work in the library of the priest Pamphilus, at Caesarea."³ S. Jerome would have learned from his

¹ Cf. Box in *ZNTW*, 1905, pp. 80 ff.

² Ibid. p. 90.

³ Cf. Mgr. Barnes' article on "The Gospel according to the Hebrews" in *J.T.S.*, April, 1905, p. 361, and see further pp. 366-368.

Jewish teacher to differentiate between Hebrew and Aramaic; there seems no sufficient reason for doubting his testimony here. Once more, Eusebius¹ mentions that Hegesippus, who lived during the second half of the second century, quotes from the Gospel of the Hebrews (Palestinian-Jewish Christians, as Nestle supposes),² particularly from the Hebrew dialect, showing that he himself was a convert from the Hebrews.

We are, it seems then, justified in believing that, at any rate, some portion of the Gospel narrative existed originally in some one or other Semitic dialect. And if this is so, the importance of getting at the original, or as near as possible to the original, needs no insisting upon.

V.

We come now to consider, in the light of what has been said, the passage Matthew v. 21, 22. As regards the Greek text of the passage there are only two points that require mention; they are both in v. 22:

τῶ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ 1^c] + εἰκη D OL Syr^{Sin} Pesh | Πακα] Παχα ND Raccha (al Rachab) OL. It is worth noting that so late an authority as the Vulgate omits εἰκῆ; the word is, moreover, out of place on other than textual grounds (see below). The various spelling of "Raca" is referred to simply for the purpose of showing that its meaning cannot have been known outside Jewish circles.

In the section immediately preceding these verses it is to be noted, firstly, that there is a strong assertion to the effect that Christ did not come to destroy the law and the prophets (vv. 17-19); and, on the other hand, an altogether new standard of righteousness is set (v. 20), of which the pith is, that the essence of keeping the law lies in the observance of the spirit, not of the letter.

¹ *Hist. Eccles.*, iv. 22.

² *Textual Criticism of the Greek Testament*, p. 96.

This blending of the old and the new is noteworthy. The whole section to which these two verses belong is concerned with men's duty towards each other as regards their *feelings*; this was new to Christ's hearers. Then again, although our Lord uses the names of earthly tribunals for expressing the degrees of punishment that men were in danger of, yet these are only *symbols* of powers which are supramundane. While guarding ourselves against a too literal interpretation of Christ's words, we are bound to assume that the *degrees* of punishment referred to were realities—are realities in the next world; and though, to be sure, we do not look for a real analogy between the degrees of punishment in this world and the next, yet our Lord clearly intended His hearers to form some definite ideas as to the degrees of punishment which these familiar *earthly* tribunals were qualified to administer. But then, on the other hand, that the mention of these tribunals was also meant to direct the thoughts of the Jews to *other* than earthly ones is clear, firstly, from the context, which lays stress on the spirit and not on the letter; secondly, from the fact that "hell of fire" had already been transferred from this world to the next by the Jews themselves (see below); and thirdly, because the procedure, as stated by our Lord, could not possibly have obtained in the Jewish tribunals of those days, for no accuser would hail a man before a judge on account of his thoughts (supposing they were known), however evil. These rather obvious remarks are made for the purpose of insisting on the fact that it is absolutely necessary to try and get at the mental attitude of the ordinary Jew of those days if we are to understand the significance of words which were primarily spoken to *them*. The present object is to try and show that in the choice of expressions which our Lord uses in these verses, there is more meaning than appears upon the surface, and that though this meaning

has, to some extent, been lost to us, yet the people to whom they were originally addressed were well aware of their point and significance. The following words in the passage demand a little examination:—

ἡ κρίσις: the word does not convey much to the mind; but it is different when we turn to the Old Syriac and the Peshitta, where we read ܡܝܬܐ, and Delitzsch in his Hebrew New Testament renders it בֵּית דִּין. The *Beth-Din* was the name of an ordinary court of justice; it was not only a civil, but also a religious authority. The special point of interest to remember here is that this court could exercise no jurisdiction in regard to the offence which our Lord speaks of. The people only knew that it was a minor tribunal from which it was possible to appeal to a higher court. Christ, so we are forced to believe, was teaching His hearers that in the divine economy, as among men, there are degrees of punishment; and the most obvious way of bringing this home to their minds was to point to tribunals with whose jurisdiction and procedure they were familiar; He leads, by degrees, from mundane to supra-mundane things.

εἰς ἡ: this is omitted by the best authorities, but its omission is demanded on other grounds as well. The fact of anger is, in man, sinful¹; the question of cause is irrelevant; simply three stages of anger are referred to, and expressed by the terms: “anger,” “raca,” “fool”; if εἰς ἡ is added to one, it ought to be added to all, otherwise the structure of the whole is broken.

παρά: this is not a Greek, but a Semitic word; the Aramaic form ܡܢܚܝܐ occurs in the Talmud,² and is used by Delitzsch in this passage; the Peshitta has ܡܢܚܝܐ; though some MSS. read ܡܢܚܝܐ; ; the Old Syriac has ܡܢܚܝܐ and

¹ “The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God” (Jas. i. 20)

² Weber, *Jüd. Theol.*, p. 317.

this spelling is etymologically certainly more correct (Schwally)¹; the word comes from the root סָפַק , “to spit,” which is also the meaning of the Hebrew root רָקַק . One is, therefore, led to believe that the underlying idea is that of “spitting”; for anyone to be spat upon implied, among the Hebrews as among ourselves, the supremest contempt²; and, therefore, to call a man “raca” expressed that stage of anger in which wrath was mingled with contempt for its object, and this is unquestionably an aggravated form of anger.

$\tau\omicron$ συνέδριον: this was the Greek name given to the highest court of the land; it had been in existence since the days of Jehoshaphat, and was a kind of *γερονσία*, or aristocratic senate, according to 2 Chron. xix. 5–11, established by this king. The Greek term became so familiar to the Jews, that it was adopted by them in the form סֵנְהֶדְרִין (Sanhedrin), a term occurring in Josephus and the Talmud. Its power and jurisdiction varied considerably during different periods, but during the time of our Lord its constitution and authority were briefly this:—It consisted of seventy-one members, to whom were added two to three scribes; the court was held in the so-called $\text{לְשַׁבֵּת הַהִנָּיִת}$ (“the hall or chamber of hewn stone”), a hall in the interior of the Temple court; it concerned itself with civil and political, as well as with religious matters, and had the power of pronouncing, but not carrying out, the death-sentence; this latter was performed by the Roman authorities. The real difference between this and the lower courts³ lay in the fact that it was the supreme tribunal of Jewry, and extended its jurisdiction not only over the Jews of Syria and Palestine, but over the whole of the “Diaspora,” while the lower

¹ Cf. Matt. xxvi. 67, xxvii. 20; Mark x. 31, where the *pacl* פָּאָל is used.

² See Deut. xxv. 9.

³ These also had the power of pronouncing the death-sentence.

courts exercised authority over a restricted area. In contra-distinction to the inferior tribunals the Sanhedrin, in its proper Jewish form, was called *בית דין הגדול* ("the great house of judgement"), and this was the term most probably used by our Lord in the passage before us. The Syriac versions do not help us here, for both have *ܟܢܥܢܐ*,¹ which can be used for any assembly, and is used for a synagogue in Matthew iv. 23, and for *ἐκκλησία* in Matthew xvi. 18; but it is significant that *ܕܝܢܐ* is used in one of the three codices of the Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels.²

μωρὲ: this word is usually taken to be Greek (cf. *οὐχὶ ἐμώρηνεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου*; 1 Corinthians i. 20; see also 1 Corinthians iii. 18, iv. 10; Matthew xxiii. 17); but three things strike one here,—after *ῥακά* one would expect another Semitic term; it is strange that the severest punishment should be pronounced against what is a very harmless word; and our Lord Himself uses the same term (if Greek) in Matthew xxiii. 17: *μωροὶ καὶ τυφλοὶ* . . . If *μωρὲ* is Greek it must mean "fool" in the modern sense of the word, but this meaning would reduce the passage in question to something bordering on nonsense; for this reason the Old Syriac version (*ܡܘܪܐ*), the Peshitta (*ܡܘܪܐ*) and Delitzsch's rendering (*נבל*), give no help. Now if we transliterate the word into Hebrew characters we get the word *מורה* (*moreh*), the present participle of the root *מרה* (Syr. *ܡܪܐ*), meaning "one who is rebellious"; but the important point about it is that, with one exception, it is always used in the Old Testament Scriptures of rebellion against *God*. It is, therefore, possible that to call a man "*moreh*" expressed that stage of anger in which wrath imputed to its object the worst

¹ Cf. the modern name for synagogue, *בֵּית־הַכְּנֶסֶת*, "the house of the assembly."

² Jacob, ZATW, xxii. p. 98.

possible sin,—rebellion against God. At any rate, it is significant that in the Talmud the doom of the fire of Gehinnom is pronounced against him who calls his neighbour a disgraceful name (see below).

ἡ γέεννα τοῦ πυρός: this is a Hebraism (אֵשׁ גִּיהֶנּוֹם); the rendering of both Syriac versions (ܩܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢ ܕܥܝܢ) is merely a literal translation of the Greek. It will be noticed that in Hebrew the expression is not “the Gehenna of fire,” but “the fire of Gehenna,” or, more correctly, “the fire of the valley of Hinuom.” But the “valley of Hinnom” was a deep valley running on the south side of Jerusalem; in days gone by it had been the scene of horrible human sacrifices to Moloch; Ahaz and Manasseh, for instance, “caused their children to pass through the fire” here. In later times the valley was used as a place both for burning the dead bodies of criminals who had been stoned, as well as the dead bodies of others; a continuous fire, therefore, for sanitary reasons, was kept up in the valley. From the fact that this was a place for the dead there arose, by degrees, the belief that a similar place existed in the next world, and it became identified with the region which, according to a much earlier conception, was the abode of departed spirits, viz. *Sheol*.¹ The fire that burned in the valley of Hinnom destroyed the Gentiles, but purified the Jews, thus making them fit for the גֶּן-עֵדֶן (“Garden of Eden” or “Paradise”). It will be seen, therefore, that “Gehenna” was a well-known place, and that it was conceived of as the counterpart of a similar place in the unseen world. It is taught in *Baba mezia* 58^b, that all Jews go down to the valley of Hinnom when they die, but all rise from it and go to the Garden of Eden, with three exceptions: adulterers, those who shame their neighbours, and those who call their neighbours by a disgraceful name²;

¹ Weber, *op cit.*, p. 341.

² *Ibid.*, p. 341.

what that name is, is not added, but one cannot help feeling that it must have been מוֹרָה ("Moreh"); and if the root-meaning is as surmised above, then the particular disgrace connected with it was that it imputed rebellion against God, the most fearful offence conceivable¹; it was equivalent to blasphemy, the very sin which the Sanhedrin imputed to our Lord, and for which they pronounced the death-sentence against Him.²

VI.

To sum up, therefore, I venture to offer the following comment upon these two verses. In contrast to the earlier Jewish teaching that sin against another consisted in murder, bodily injury, theft, and false witness (each of which could be made good by a money payment or its equivalent), Christ sets a vastly higher ethical standard in the relationship between man and man, in that he declares that, according to the idea of God, sins equally as bad as those mentioned can be committed invisibly, by the heart.³ In the verses before us Christ is dealing with the subject of anger, and He selects three representative attitudes of mind, or states of the heart; there is first, anger pure and simple; then that aggravated form of anger which regards its object with contempt; lastly, anger which is of so bitter a nature that it imputes to its object the worst offence imaginable. It is these three *states of the heart* that Christ denounces, and He teaches at the same time, on the analogy of earthly tribunals, that punishment is meted out hereafter proportionate to each.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

¹ It is well to bear in mind the significance which the Jews placed on individual words on account of what they *implied*; "word-plays" are of the commonest occurrence in the Old Testament as well as in other Jewish literature. Let it also be remembered that "calling names" is a Semitic characteristic; the Arabs are the most foul-mouthed people in existence.

² Cf. Mark xiv. 63-64.

³ Cf. the same principle with regard to adultery, Matt. v. 28.

“THE GREATER SIN.”

A NOTE ON S. JOHN XIX. 11.

Ὅτι εἶχες ἐξουσίαν κατ' ἐμοῦ οὐδεμίαν εἰ μὴ ἦν δεδομένον σοι ἄνωθεν διὰ τοῦτο παραδούς μέ σοι μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν ἔχει.

(WESTCOIT AND HORT'S TEXT).

“THOU wouldst have no power against me, except it were given thee from above : therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath greater sin.” So this passage runs in the R.V. ; and (reading “ authority ” instead of “ power ”) we may accept it as a fair translation of our Lord’s words as recorded by S. John.

To reach the popular interpretation of the passage, we must add to the translation a paraphrase. The apparent meaning, the meaning that most men give to the words, is something like this : “ Thou wouldst have no authority to hurt me, if this authority were not given thee from heaven : therefore he-that-delivered-me ” (i.e. the traitor Judas) “ to thee hath a sin that is greater,” either “ because thine authority is a trust from heaven ” or “ because he delivered me to thee.” A variant of this interpretation is supplied by some critics, who believe that “ from above ” may mean “ from the Roman Emperor, thy superior officer.” With these slight divergences in detail, I think the above paraphrase expresses the popular belief as to the meaning of our Lord’s words.

Obviously, the correctness of this view must be tried by two entirely different tests ; the meaning of the individual words used by our Lord, and the bearing of the passage, as a whole, on the context and the facts of the case. Under the second head we may also include another point—the relevance of the second clause to the first. They are joined by διὰ τοῦτο, and (in spite of a grammatical difficulty in the use of the Accusative) διὰ τοῦτο is undoubtedly sound idiomatic Greek for “ therefore.” So we must not

only examine the individual words and the context, but also find such a *nexus* as will justify the use of the causative διὰ τοῦτο between the two clauses.

Now we may frankly admit that, at first sight, there are many things in favour of the popular interpretation. There are parallels for the use of ἄνωθεν in the sense of "from heaven," and, on the other hand, it is quite possible to apply it to the over-lordship of the Cæsar. The New Testament frankly teaches the duty of obedience to the Emperor as supreme: it also teaches, just as frankly, the dependence of all magisterial authority on God. Κατ' ἐμοῦ, too, may mean "against me." The words "ὁ παραδούς" with "με" or "αὐτόν" are *almost* technical, accompanying the name of Judas in the Apostolic lists and elsewhere. The δεδομένον of the first clause might—through that device of "*constructio ad sensum*," by which critics save the grammatical reputation of classical writers—be held to apply to an implied ἐξουσία, in spite of the difference in gender. But, even when these admissions are made, it seems to me that there are insuperable difficulties in the way of this interpretation.

(1) First of all, none of these words *necessarily* bears the meaning thus given to it. Ἄνωθεν occurs in twelve other places in the New Testament. In two of these—parallel passages in S. Matthew and S. Mark—it means "from the top," in a physical sense. "The veil of the Temple was rent ἄνωθεν." S. John also uses the word in the same sense: our Lord's χιτῶν was woven "ἄνωθεν, κ.τ.λ." S. Luke uses it twice in reference to time—"from the beginning" (S. Luke i. 3, and Acts xxvi. 5). S. John has it in two verses (iii. 3 and 7), in the sense of "again"; and S. Paul (Gal. iv. 9) with the cognate meaning of "back again." In one other passage in the Fourth Gospel (iii. 31) and three in the Epistle of S. James (i. 17 and iii. 15, 17) ἄνωθεν means "from heaven." In the passage

under our consideration it is quite evident that we are not restricted to the interpretation "from heaven," and that the words *may* mean "from Cæsar." But it is quite as evident that they may mean "from a superior authority," whatever that authority may be. *Κατ' ἐμοῦ*, too, may mean either "against me" or "in my case."

Παραδίδωμι, again, simply means to "give over" or "deliver"; its use in the sense of "betray" is only a sub-meaning. It is used in the New Testament in several different senses; but the only meanings calling for special notice at present are those which throw some light on our text. The Jews themselves use the verb in describing their own action in bringing our Lord to Pilate (chap. xviii. 30); the same word is used of Pilate's "delivering" our Lord to the Jews (chap. xix. 16). Again, in Acts iii. 13, S. Peter says that the Jews "betrayed" or "delivered up" (*παρεδώκατε*) our Lord. So, too, we may observe that, while "*ὁ παραδούς*" (or *παραδιδούς*) "*αὐτόν*" (or *με*) is a phrase almost technically used of Judas, the phrase here is "*ὁ παραδούς μέ σοι*," which is an entirely different thing.

(2) But the common interpretation has to face worse difficulties.

(a) The order of the words "*ἐξουσίαν κατ' ἐμοῦ οὐδεμίαν*" certainly emphasises "*κατ' ἐμοῦ*." The point is not that Pilate's jurisdiction, as a whole, was derived, usurped, or restricted; but that it was so in this particular case. Moreover, the emphasis laid on *κατ' ἐμοῦ* seems to bear a relation to a similar emphasis laid by Pilate on *ἐμοί* in the question "*ἐμοὶ οὐ λαλεῖς*;" It appears, too, to refer to the latter part of Pilate's question, in which he claims a power of life and death over our Lord. The statement that the Roman *Legatus* was answerable to God, or that he was merely the deputy of Cæsar, would neither have met the case nor accounted for Pilate's subsequent action.

(β) Again, the use of the neuter *δεδομένον* is quite in accordance with Greek usage, if we suppose that it refers to a subject omitted but easily understood. It can hardly refer to a feminine subject already used in the first part of the sentence.

(γ) Yet, again, Judas had neither betrayed nor in any way delivered our Lord to Pilate. Base as was his crime his action is spoken of by Christ Himself and by the Evangelists as a betrayal *to the Jews*; and his whole action seems to show that he never thought of the intervention of the Roman power. If, again, the theory now generally held as to the motives of Judas be sound,—if he were the son of Simon “the Kananæan,” and had grown up with wild visions of a renewed Jewish kingdom working in his mind,—he would naturally have had dealings with the High Priest and the Sanhedrin, but would have avoided the Roman Governor as a visible emissary of the Devil. The whole consistency of the history is destroyed, if we suppose Judas to have, either in thought or deed, moved a finger towards transferring the trial of Christ from the Jewish authorities to Pilate; yet it is to this very transference that our Lord’s words naturally apply.

(δ) Taking these points into account, we may add another. If we suppose that our Lord referred to Judas, the *nexus* of the two clauses is absolutely destroyed. Neither the dependence of Pilate’s power on the Almighty, nor his position as a subordinate of the Emperor, nor the transference of the case to the Roman tribunal, could have added one iota to the sin of the traitor. So, too, if we suppose that the final words mean “a sin greater than thine,” it is impossible to see how any of these conditions could have either lessened Pilate’s guilt or aggravated that of Judas.

This destructive process might be continued further, and one might show how the few words of our verse literally

bristle with difficulties, if we interpret either of its clauses in the usual way. But it seems unnecessary to use any more dialectic, seeing that the context, and the story as told us by S. John, give ample materials for a self-consistent and better rendering. This rendering, too, brings certain facts in the story of our Lord's trial into their true perspective, and helps us to apportion the relative guilt of the persons who helped to bring about the Tragedy of Calvary.

Taking the antecedent clause first, it is obvious that *κατ' ἐμοῦ* may mean either "against me" or "in relation to me." As, however, Pilate had not shown any bias against our Lord, and also because it agrees best with the context, I prefer the latter rendering. So, too (seeing that, of all things, a feminine substantive occurring a few words before is the least likely "subject understood" before the neuter *δεδομένον*), one is obliged to answer the question, "What was given to Pilate *ἄνωθεν*?" by reference to something that would at the time be clear to the Roman Governor himself. I can find no possible answer but one. The trial of our Lord had been transferred to the Roman Court. All this seems plain enough; the use of *ἄνωθεν* may present a greater difficulty. We have seen, however, that this word is used in many senses in the New Testament; and—for the matter of that—is classical Greek. One very clear meaning is, "from a higher source." Taking account of the context, it seems here to mean, "from a higher Court." The Court thus referred to can be none but the Sanhedrin.

It is perfectly consistent with our Lord's usage that He should treat the Sanhedrin as, in this particular case, "the court above."¹ He always sharply distinguished the

¹ My friend, Mr J. Henry Harris, of Mevagissey, who is a competent authority on Syriac, has kindly sent me a communication on this text. He considers that (1) the rendering in the Peshito makes it quite certain that the Syriac translators did not consider that *ἄνωθεν* here means "from heaven": and (2) that the word they use is best susceptible of a

personal characters of both the Pharisaic teachers and the Sadducean priests from their official duties. At His trial before the Sanhedrin He stood mute before the personal mockery of Caiaphas; but, when the High Priest used the accepted formula for "putting Him on His oath," He answered immediately. True, He also taught the duty of obedience to the Roman power; but there is no sign in the Gospel story of His recognising in any way the jurisdiction of Pilate in His own particular case. He dealt with Pilate sympathetically, when that rough and brave "ex-private" found himself face to face with the greatest difficulty of his life; but it was with the *man* Pilate, not with the Roman Governor. He paid no respect to the *man* Caiaphas; but He recognised the jurisdiction of the High Priest.

And this would have been perfectly clear to Pilate. The much-abused Gallio seems to have quite understood the limitations of his office. He was, possibly, a little careless about maintaining order; but he may well have preferred the risk of a slight riot to the greater danger of exceeding his constitutional powers. Pilate—though he was no lawyer, but simply a brave soldier pushed into a position for which he had no capability—cannot have been unaware that the political offence with which our Lord was charged was "trumped-up." Everything in the story shows his knowledge of the fact that the real cause of trouble was "a matter of" the Jewish "Law," and therefore outside his jurisdiction. It was perfectly natural that our Lord should speak of the Sanhedrin as "a higher court," and that Pilate should acquiesce in this view of that court's functions.

local sense—The latter suggestion is ingenious, and it is quite consistent with the fact that the Temple, in one of whose courts the Sanhedrin would sit, stood on higher ground than the rest of the city; and therefore than the *Prætorium*: still, I think that, while both the Greek and the Syriac are capable of being rendered "from a higher authority," the context makes this the better translation.

So we may paraphrase the first clause thus: "Thou wouldest have had no jurisdiction in this case of *Mine*, if the case had not been transferred to thee from a higher court." Thus understood, the words are an answer to Pilate's question, "Dost thou not answer *me*?" Thus understood, they exactly meet Pilate's claim to jurisdiction in that particular case. Thus understood, they explain the "therefore" that follows, and throw full light on the meaning of the consequent clause.

To show this, we must remember that the Fourth Gospel throws special emphasis on one particular side of our Lord's betrayal and trial. S. John tells us that the idea of putting our Lord to death originated with Caiaphas, and cites the words in which that cynical Sadducee embodied his cold-blooded purpose. Later on he again refers to this incident. He also shows us Caiaphas as the ruling spirit of the Sanhedrin, and emphasises the fact that Caiaphas delivered up Christ to Pilate because this was the only way in which he could carry out his intention. Excommunication would not have met the case—from the point of view of Caiaphas. Through the whole story in the Fourth Gospel we see clearly how "the Jews"—with Caiaphas as their prime instigator—took advantage of Pilate's perilous condition with the Roman authorities in order to bring about our Lord's execution. We have seen that the verb *παράδωμι* has been already used by S. John to describe the transference of the trial. Taking account of the whole circumstances, "*ὁ παραδούς μέ σοι*" can be none other than Caiaphas.

This interpretation fulfils everything requisite in the case. It puts our Lord's words in agreement with the context. It shows why, from the moment the words were spoken, Pilate grew more anxious to release Him. All the while the Legatus seems to have been impressed with the Personality of Christ; those words showed him more

clearly that he was simply being used as a tool. He had killed many men, both in warfare and in a cruelly harsh use of the *ἐξουσία* on which he dwelt so proudly. But we can well realise that there was a rough conscience under that rough man's oppressiveness, and that his pride and his conscience were both humbled at the part he had to play. And, finally, it throws a full light on the words "greater sin."

The sin of Caiaphas was greater—greater in itself and far greater than that of Pilate,—*because* he had sent the case on to the Roman Court. He had abandoned his lawful jurisdiction simply in order to inflict a punishment beyond his legal power. Plainly—and we can hardly excuse this cynical unbeliever on the score of religious zeal—he had plotted, planned and carried out a murder. I confess that Judas himself—in spite of the aggravations implied in his intimacy with our Lord—looms less guiltily in my eyes than does Caiaphas, and that the Traitor's kiss seems no more repulsive than either the deliberate suborning of that Traitor in order that he might enable his purchaser to carry out his cold-blooded cruelty, or the deliberate driving of Pilate to commit legal murder against his will and his knowledge of the law. And one's sense of justice is satisfied by finding that our Lord Himself spoke one sentence which may help us to fix on the right man the "greater guilt" in "the greatest crime that has been done in the world."

ALEX. R. EAGAR.

THE SUFFERING OF GOD.

For some years this thought has been haunting our theological consciousness. Some tentative discussions have taken place, for the greater part, on the circumference of the subject. My claim to the right to intervene is that for

ten years I have preached this truth. It is the basis of my Gospel for a sinful world : what I have here written is a confession of faith, and contains what might be elaborated into a theory of the Atonement. A God who cannot suffer cannot be my God : my soul refuses to worship Him. Abstract theorems about the perfection of the Divine nature are as absurd as the pre-Baconian axioms of natural science, and as likely to lead to the discovery of truth. Thought is more than logic ; and thought, laying hold of life and not of bare notions, affirms that the God of man must suffer. Only so is any relation between them spiritually possible. What man is he must be to his God, and in God. Nor will the heart of man acknowledge divinity in passionless calm, or Heaven in Arctic bliss. What then, when we seek, do we find God to be ?

To guard oneself from idols was the last injunction of the New Testament, and has been the first and last omission of Theology. Men have made for themselves images of God, and have thence proceeded deductively to educe theology. The Scriptures have been useful in those parts that have lent themselves to the support of the positions already taken up. For many Bacon has lived in vain, and for some in modern days J. S. Mill's strictures on the syllogism have had no existence. And yet it is obvious that deductive logic can reveal no truth, and, if she be our guide, imprisons us in the idolatry of our own conceptions. She can only rivet the propositions already affirmed. Too often has she been mistress in theology, when she should have been but the handmaid of thought in the study of life.

The essential vice of the deductive method is seen in the theological treatment of Christ. It has brought its cast-iron idea of what God is, and has sought to prove that Jesus was divine by crushing into the frame His lineaments, and leaving all that was not so amenable to make up the

portrait of His humanity, until between the Christ of Dogmatics and the Jesus of the Gospels there has been no connexion whatever except by courtesy, and almost as little between the God of Theology and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

All fruitful discovery is by way of research and induction, and we must be content to burn our idols, to bury the idea of God we have gained from the unregulated intercourse of Paganism, philosophy and Scripture, and humbly to set ourselves to know Him who is the only adequate source of the knowledge of God. I will not bring to Christ my conceptions of the Divine; rather will I learn of Him what indeed Divinity may be. The Word became flesh that Divinity might be translated into the language of human life, a language known to us all, in which none need err.

It will be instructive to note in passing that the deductive method of the study of the Divine Nature has never arrived, and never could arrive, at the discovery that Humility is a cardinal attribute of God. Yet Paul saw this. The passage in his Epistle to the Philippians, rightly interpreted (as by Dr. Gifford) shows us that what Christ parted with was only equality with God; the essential Form of God He retained, and, while retaining it, stooped to the depths of humility and service, only thus fulfilling the mind that was originally in Him, and which led to the Emptying and the Incarnation. In all this no detriment was done to the Form of God. And Paul has won for us the truth, that as an attribute Humility is absolutely essential and original in God, while omnipotence can be laid aside, the Form of God being still retained. The essential attributes are those of character; they cannot be laid aside; they constitute God; without them He would not be "God"; whereas the physical attributes, such as omnipotence, might belong to a being of Satanic spirit, as might Impassibility. Christ showed us what is Divine. "No

man"—O ye idol-makers—"hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."

Jesus was the Word of God, in all the things revealing Him. That revelation was progressive through the years of His ministry, culminating in Calvary. The glory of the Gospel is dimmed by all attempts to divide Christ against Himself, into human and divine. Once more, how do we know what is divine until we look upon Him? The Word which was with God, and which was God, BECAME flesh—did not assume flesh—and the glory of that life was "glory as of the only begotten from the Father." In Christ the Human and the Divine are one. Calvary has won the heart of man: has that victory been won by the Divine or by another? Won it most surely has been by the suffering. Was that suffering merely the suffering of man, while the God we are asked to worship stood behind passionless and unmoved, calmly ordering all that was? Is that the God we have made for ourselves?

Calvary, then, is the supreme place of Christ's revelation of God. Here more than elsewhere he that hath seen Jesus hath seen the Father. Jesus is here God revealing Himself in time. What is true in the Eternal stands at last unveiled amid the days of earth. To see Jesus meeting men and sin and sorrow is to learn how God bears Himself towards man and sin and sorrow. And never did Jesus so completely reveal God, never did the Son so perfectly image the Father, as on Calvary.

It is here that I worship, and the Deity of Christ is all my creed. I see God bearing sin. Calvary becomes one brief opening to my eyes of God's eternity. I put away all the tortuous theories whereby men have sought to connect Calvary with God: simply to the Cross I cling. I have arrived: this is God. I do not need any explanation: I have reached the ultimate, that which has been from the

foundation of the world, the Lamb slain. I cannot find any other God: if I look into the midst of the Throne, I see a Lamb slain (Rev. v. 6). God is manifested to me as the Bearer of Sin, and I understand that. I believe in the blood of God, I catch a glimpse of the illimitable suffering. "In Him we live and move and have our being," and that means for Him the bearing of all our lives and all our sin. "Whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Jesus learned that of His Father, and is but telling them to be perfect as their Heavenly Father is perfect. I know now what forgiveness costs, forgiveness where there can be no forgetting, but only bearing. The sin of man is expiated in the blood of God.

It has been so from the foundation of the world. Every sin has told in the consciousness of God, and the years of man have been the years of His passion and of His pardon. When God created, all contingencies were allowed for, and the foundation duly laid—His own Father's heart. But man did not know, and could not tell, though premonitions there were in many lands. So at last the Christ came, and it was His to realize earth in human manner the life of God. Towards this He lived, being made perfect by suffering; but when He came to Gethsemane, to enter into the full fellowship of the Father's agony, even He shrank. But by no other way was perfect sonship possible, and He attained. In the cry of desolation He enters into the knowledge of that loneliness in which God suffers: He joined His Father there, taking Humanity in Himself. In His death cry we see the breaking of the earthly vessel which can stand the agony no more, and the letting go of His Spirit "into Thy hands," into the freedom of unfettered suffering.

¹ We cannot understand the Cross if we look at it alone;

¹ This paragraph and some sentences in others are taken from my book published in 1897: *Jesus, Son of God* (Elliot Stock). I may say here that I have not read Dr. W. N. Clarke's *Outline of Theology* (1898).

we must look beyond. It is profane and it is useless to seek to find in the pain of the dying Jesus the equivalent of the deserved punishment of man. We may not balance the sin of the centuries by the few hours of that awful day. But we can understand the Cross if we see that, like all in the life of Jesus, it was a revelation of the Eternal. His suffering was on earth as the suffering of God in Heaven. Jesus bore sin and all its pain, with all its malice, because He was Son of God, the image of the Father; and He thereby told us that this world's sin is borne on the Father's heart. Only a few hours before He had with full emphasis of passionate feeling declared to His nearest disciples that the Father was in Him, and He in the Father. The dread side of those words was interpreted on Calvary. Through the centuries God has borne man's sin; the Father has taken into His heart the arrows winged by the hand of the prodigal; has kissed the penitent and said nothing of the pain. But He spoke once—in His Son. On Calvary the agony of God was seen for one hour. The heavens opened, and men saw the heart of the Father and the blood of God. We cannot see how all our sins were borne on the Cross, but we can see how they all are borne this day upon the heart of God that Jesus revealed. And we can see how God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses. And we can dimly see the cost of it all.

. This position is the only one from which can be read the meaning of Hebrews ii. 9, the verse which has been so tortured by interpreters. All that was lacking for its interpretation was this point of view. Now we see that Christ suffered on Calvary so fully that "because of the suffering of death" undergone He was "crowned with [this] glory and honour, [viz.] that by the grace of God He should taste death for every man" now and until sin be no more. He, who in this suffering had been so faithful on Golgotha, was exalted

to the dread throne of universal Saviourhood, where John saw Him as a Lamb slain (Rev. v. 6), the eternal Word of God, the eternal revelation of God, to man. For John the Christ of Calvary has become the eternal Christ.

Now the climax of the New Testament is John's Gospel, and, leaving aside John's additional chapter, the climax of his Gospel is the twentieth chapter, and this ends in the first ascription to Jesus of the name "God." This name is won when Jesus returns to Thomas *with the marks of His passion upon Him*. Those marks did not lie; they spoke a present truth, and Jesus revealed Himself so that He might ever be so known, the same to-day as yesterday. It is the Crucified who is God, and the Crucified who is on the throne of history (Rev. v.-vi.). Except we see the print of the nails, we will not believe. And when we see that print, we know it is the word of Him who said, "I AM THE TRUTH." We rest there with him who said, "My Lord and—my God," and with him who wrote, "Guard yourselves from idols. Jesus Christ—this is the true God, and eternal life."

F. Warburton Lewis.

THE ORIGINAL CONTENTS OF CODEX BEZAE.

CODEx Bezae, D, or δ 5 (as Von Soden chooses to call it) is our only "Western" authority for the Greek text of the Gospels and Acts. Much of it is lost, but it is important to know what were its former contents. This is fortunately no difficult or uncertain task.

The codex gives the four Gospels in the old Latin order, Mt., Jo., Lc., Mc., (a few sheets being missing,) as far as Mc. xvi. 14 in the Greek, and Mc. xvi. 5 in the Latin. Then 66 leaves are lost.¹ Next come the last verses of the Third Epistle of St. John; lastly, the Acts of the Apostles

¹ I take the description from Scrivener's edition.

as far as ch. xxii. 20 in the Latin, xxii. 29 in the Greek. The question is, "what was contained in the 66 leaves that are lost?" The number of leaves is certain, for the manuscript is regularly made up of quaternions, the signatures of which remain, where they have not been cut away by the binder. Scrivener supposed that the Third Epistle of St John was the last of the seven Catholic Epistles, and he has been followed by many others. He says p. xv.:

Our only difficulty is with the Catholic Epistles, which could hardly have covered more than fifty of the missing sixty-six leaves between the end of St. Mark and the beginning of the Acts, even though we suppose that St. Jude was inserted, as in some catalogues, otherwise than in the last place. Since the superfluous sixteen leaves would suffice neither for the Epistle to the Hebrews, nor for the Apocalypse, nor for any other book at all likely to occur in such a position, *but would take up exactly two quires* [italics are Scrivener's], we venture to suggest that the original penman may have miscounted his quires by two at some place in the portion that is lost; just as we know that one of two later scribes must have done in Cod. Sinaiticus, inasmuch as they differ by unity in numbering the quires from the commencement of St. Paul's Epistles (*Quat.* 82 or 81) down to the end of the manuscript."

This ingenious suggestion might have been useful, had there been any probability whatever that the seven Catholic epistles should be found in Codex Bezae. Studies in the text of St. Cyprian have taught me the importance of noting the contents and order of different families of manuscripts; and it is certainly needful to consider what books belong to the "Western text," before attempting to reconstruct Codex Bezae. Now if we examine the earliest authors who use the Western text, we find that St. Irenaeus only seems to know 1, 2 [and 3?] John and 1 Peter; that St. Cyprian knows only the same; that Tertullian knows St. Jude also; that the old Latin apparently originally agreed with Tertullian; and that the Muratorian Canon also agrees with all the rest in omitting James and 2 Peter. Codex Bezae represents a very early text, and there is no

reason at all for supposing that it ever contained James or 2 Peter, and some reason for supposing that it did not contain Jude. We must therefore work upon some other basis.

To begin with, the scribe of D invariably begins a book at the top of a new column, without any title. He always places the title immediately after the *explicit* of the preceding book in the column next before the new book, that is to say, in the last column of the preceding book. For instance, we have fol. 103*b* (left side of open book), the last seven verses of St. Matthew, and then “*εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ μαθθαιον ἐτελεσθη | ἀρχεται εὐαγγέλιον | κατὰ ἰωαννην*”; the right hand page (fol. 104*a*) is the Latin, and exactly corresponds. If we turn over the leaf, we find the first words of St. John’s Gospel beginning at the top of the column. The same arrangement is found for the commencement of St. Luke, of St. Mark, and of Acts.

There are invariably 33 lines in a column. These lines are sense lines (what St. Jerome apparently means by writing *per cola et commata*), but the original divisions of the parent MS. have been disarranged by the scribe of D, as Scrivener has shown, pp. xxiii. and xvii. He remarks p. xvii. :

In the first Gospel, although many of the clauses are not balanced in the strict and regular fashion which would have satisfied the laws of parallelism as laid down by Bishop Jebb (e.g. Matt. vi. 1; ix. 17; xi. 21; xiii. 40; xvi. 18; xxvi. 51, etc.); though a few lines end in *γὰρ* (iv. 10; vi. 7; xvii. 15), or in *δε* (xx. 2), or even in the article (vi. 6; xiv. 35; xix. 1), yet the close of each *στίχος* usually coincides with some slight pause in the sense. With the first page of St. John the dissolution of the verses becomes much more marked (e.g. i. 4, 10, 13), and though only one line (i. 16) ends with the article before ch. vi. 32, yet such irregularity occurs no less than 48 times from that place to the end of the Gospel, while in the succeeding Gospel of St. Luke an entire breaking up of the stichometry becomes rather the practice than the exception; about Luke viii. the dissolution seems adopted almost in preference: prepositions being separated from their cases (e.g. John xiv. 23; xxi. 8; Luke vii. 20; viii. 13; x. 7), or even words (not

always compound words) are divided, whether in the Greek (e.g. John xiii. 36; Luke i. 1; vi. 1, 38; vii. 6; xxi. 36), or in the Latin (e.g. Matt. xviii. 33; John vi. 18), or in both (Luke v. 19; vi. 9, 48; vii. 20). As the work proceeds from the middle of St. Luke onwards (however we may account for the fact), the arrangement of the *στίχοι* becomes less broken and careless, though some of the chief anomalies are met with even to the last (e.g. Mark xiii. 22 *Gk. Lat.*; Acts iii. 26 *Gk.*, x. 41 *Gk.*; xi. 2 *Lat.*).

These interesting remarks of Scrivener's are curiously confirmed by an examination of the lengths of the lines in the various books. The scribe was not likely to shorten the lines of the original; in fact, it is easy to assure oneself that the disturbances have been caused by his lengthening them; and consequently, in those books in which there is more disturbance, the lines of Codex Bezae are longer. I use in the following table the number of syllables which Dr. Rendel Harris has counted in Westcott and Hort's edition. I take the figures he gives from the column in which he has counted the abbreviated words, *θεός, κύριος, ἰησοῦς, χριστός* as a single syllable.¹

	<i>Syllables</i> <i>W.H.</i>		<i>Lines</i> <i>Cod. Bezae.</i>		<i>Syllables</i> <i>in line.</i>		<i>Syllables</i> <i>in page.</i>
Matthew	38,352	...	3,389	...	11·31	...	373·23
John	30,794	...	2,565	...	12·	...	396·
Luke	40,816	...	3,396	...	12·02	...	396·6
Mark	24,576	...	1,511	...	11·7	...	386·1

At random I count a column of Codex Bezae at the beginning of St. Matthew, and I find 356 syllables; I count another in the middle of St. Luke, and there I find 443. In the Acts the scribe begins with short lines, and suddenly continues with longer ones on the ninth page. The following figures are roughly counted:

¹ J. R. Harris, *Stichometry*, p. 51. He gives the number of sixteen-syllabled lines. I consequently multiply his figures by 16. I have added 400 syllables to St. Mark, for the last 12 verses, and 346 to St. John for the *Pericope adulterae*.

ACTS i. 1.		
fol. 415 <i>b</i> 338 syll.	fol. 423 <i>b</i> 374 syll.	fol. 431 <i>b</i> 381 syll.
416 <i>b</i> 316	424 <i>b</i> 378	432 <i>b</i> 383
417 <i>b</i> 348	425 <i>b</i> 367	433 <i>b</i> 376
418 <i>b</i> 346	426 <i>b</i> 365	434 <i>b</i> 358
419 <i>b</i> 322	427 <i>b</i> 362	435 <i>b</i> 340
420 <i>b</i> 335	428 <i>b</i> 384	436 <i>b</i> 366
421 <i>b</i> 324	429 <i>b</i> 369	437 <i>b</i> 368
422 <i>b</i> 318	430 <i>b</i> 390	438 <i>b</i> 359

The increase beginning fol. 423*b* is very noticeable. The scribe seems to have bethought himself all at once that he was wasting parchment. The average of the first eight places is 329·4, or less than 10 syllables to the line (there are invariably 33 lines to the page in Codex Bezae). The average of the remaining 16 places is 356·52, or 10·8 syllables to the line. The average of the last five remaining pages of Acts is about 360, or 10·9 syllables to the line.

With these statistics it is easy to calculate the amount contained in the lost 66 pages.

1. Fol. 415*a* contains the Latin of 3 John from v. 11 "qui malefacit non vidit dñm" inclusively. The lost fol. 414*b* contained the corresponding Greek. The Epistle up to this point has 362 syllables (W. & H.), which will just carry us back as far as the top of fol. 413*b*.

2. The lower part of fol. 412*b* will have had *Επιστολη ·β· Ιωανου επληρωθη αρχεται επιστολη ·γ·*. 2 John contains $30 \times 16 = 480$ syllables. It will have taken the whole of fol. 411*b*, and the upper part of 412*b*.

3. The lower part of 410*b* will have contained the inscriptions, *Επιστολη ·α· Ιωανου επληρωθη αρχεται επιστολη ·β·*. The First Epistle of St. John has 4,192 syllables. It is not likely that the scribe rose again to the high figure he attained in St. Luke of 396½ syllables per page (in parts much higher). In St. Mark we have seen that he has decreased to 386, in 3 John he has 362, while in the beginning of Acts he has gone down to 329½, though he soon

goes back to 356½. With 380 syllables to the page, 1 John would take 11 pages and one line over. With 350 lines to the page, it would take 11 pages and 32 lines over, leaving only one line (four would be needed) for the *explicit* and *incipit* on fol. 410*b*. We may thus be fairly certain that 1 John took 11½ pages, viz., from fol. 399*b* to fol. 410*b* inclusively.

We have now accounted for 16 pages, from fol. 399*b* to fol. 414*b* inclusively. There remain to be accounted for, 50 pages, fol. 349*b*–398*b* inclusively. (Fol. 348*b* is also lost; it contained the last five verses of St. Mark, and its *explicit*, together with the *incipit* of the following book, whatever this may have been.) These 50 pages would contain at most $(50 \times 33) - 4 = 1,646$ lines, and at least $(50 \times 33) - 32 = 1,618$ lines; for there are 33 lines in a page; and the last page cannot have contained more than 29 lines (excluding the *explicit* of the book, and the *incipit* of 1 John), nor less than one line. If we take 1,640 as a probable number of lines and multiply it by 11·7 (the number of syllables per line in St. Mark, the book which precedes the gap in Codex Bezae), we arrive at 19,188 syllables as the number of syllables contained in the missing book. The number of syllables in the Apocalypse is about 19,408. There is scarcely room for doubt, in consequence, that the Apocalypse was the missing book.

* * * * *

From the time when Codex Bezae was written until the ninth century it was frequently corrected, almost entirely on the Greek side, but there is no trace of its having been used for liturgical purposes. But from the ninth century to the twelfth, inclusively, it received successive liturgical notes and directions, and also marginal headings or *τίτλοι*, which seem to show that it was sometimes so used.¹

¹ J. R. Harris, *Annotators of Cod. Bezae*, p. 6, and Burkitt in *Journal of Theol. Studies*, July, 1902, p. 505: "There is no indication that Codex Bezae has ever been formally and publicly used except as a Greek book."

Some missing leaves were supplied by a hand which Scrivener (p. xxi.) ascribes to "about the tenth century." It would seem that the liturgical use of the book necessitated the restoration of the lost pages of the Gospels. We see that fol. 7 had fallen out, the whole of the 22nd quaternion (foll. 169-176) and foll. 348-9. These eleven leaves were supplied by the addition of nine others.

Foll. 348-9 contained the end of St. Mark's Gospel, and fol. 349 *verso* contained the first column (Greek) of the Apocalypse. The next leaf also (the last of quaternion 44), and the next eight quaternions have disappeared. Such a bulk can hardly have been lost by accident, nor is it likely that precisely the whole of the Apocalypse and Johannine Epistles should fall out by accident, leaving Acts entire. The idea suggests itself that the possessors of the Codex did not regard the Apocalypse as canonical, and removed it. This might explain the loss of the last leaf of Mark, which contained the *incipit* of the Apocalypse, but it would not explain the cutting out of the preceding leaf. If the last was intentionally removed, this was not done with the purpose of copying it on a new leaf; for the new leaves have a text of a wholly different character. The loss of the two leaves of Mark, therefore, took place some time before the renewal of the leaves. If, again, the Apocalypse was objectionable, yet the three Epistles of St. John would not be rejected. A better hypothesis seems to be that the leaves 348-9 and 350 (being the last three of the 44th gathering), had fallen out because one or two quaternions immediately following had gone beforehand. The Apocalypse being thus incomplete was not restored as were the Gospels, simply because it was not wanted for liturgical use. A part of the three Epistles may equally have been missing. Consequently, on some occasion when the Codex needed rebinding, the missing pages of the Gospels were supplied, while all that remained

of the Johannine writings was removed. Probably Acts was at this time complete. It has now lost its last three quaternions, and two leaves out of the last remaining quaternion, evidently owing to a loosening of the binding, —perhaps after long liturgical usage, followed by careless treatment as rubbish.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON LAWLESSNESS.

A FAVOURITE position taken by modern Agnosticism, although not always frankly and freely presented, is a practical denial of the idea of sin; of sin as it is set forth in Holy Scripture in its nature and effects, of sin in its mischief and madness, of sin as it has been wept for, struggled against, and triumphed over by countless generations of Christian souls through the grace and power of the Redeemer.

How is it then? Is there no such thing as moral evil? Can any sane man, with elementary conceptions of the difference between right and wrong, deny its presence, its force and fateful issues? "No," says the Agnostic, "I do not go so far as that, my contention rather is that the special idea of sin is a creation of the brain of ecclesiastics and theologians. What Christians call sin in the individual I prefer to describe as a neglect of the necessary conditions of his life, it is a going over the boundary line set by utility, and if he does thus transgress, he must pay the inevitable penalty." Beneath these high-sounding phrases with which those who know the drift of Agnostic sentiment are only too well acquainted there is an underlying truth. And in so far as there is this truth Christians will already find it expressed for themselves. For there is no maxim, no idea, no suggestion in moral philosophy that is just and wise which is not caught up, illustrated, purified, and consecrated in and through the Christian Faith. All that is true in

this Agnostic idea is therefore already expressed in many a pregnant phrase and passage in the pages of the New Testament.

St. John declares that sin is lawlessness.¹ He emphatically identifies the two concepts. The term law, as he and his brother Apostles use it, means, by derivation, a line straightly drawn. St. Paul is most explicit, for he combines with this figure the conception of transgression. Sin, according to the teaching of this Apostle, is the crossing of a boundary line, or rule, set finally by the authority of God. Sin is the assertion of the selfish will against Divine enactments. It is a violation of the Divine law of man's being. It is a general term which combines in itself all possible failures to fulfil obligations to self, to others, to God. Agnostics and Christians are then on common ground in the admission of moral evil, and therefore of a moral law. They differ in this stupendous regard, that the Christian believes also in God as Law-giver and Judge, in one awful Being in Whom resides the great prerogatives of sanction whether of reward or punishment, and therefore in One who will by no means clear the obstinately guilty.

If the New Testament be carefully examined, the idea of lawlessness stands revealed, and it is as a picture, ominous, terrible. It is a term by which those are described who receive their dismissal at the last from the Lord. They are to depart from Him because they work lawlessness.² It is a task of His angels to remove men of such type out of His kingdom before they are delivered to punishment.³ Lawlessness is linked with hypocrisy in Christ's scathing condemnation of scribes and Pharisees⁴; His people are warned that when this spirit and temper are abroad its effect will be the chilling of love. Again, St. Paul, in a quotation from the thirty-second Psalm, re-echoes the

¹ 1 St. John iii. 4.

² St. Matt. vii. 23.

³ St. Matt. xiii. 41.

⁴ St. Matt. xxiii. 28.

blessed estate of him whose acts of lawlessness are forgiven.¹ He shows the contagion of such a mind and temper;² he warns his Corinthian converts against that saddest of inequalities in marriages, when there is disunion in faith, which he indicates by the antithesis of righteousness and lawlessness.³ He bids the Thessalonians beware that its insidious spirit, though held in check awhile, is even now at work, and that a time will come when the lawless personality will stand revealed until his destruction at the presence of the Lord.⁴ It is, indeed, according to St. Paul, the crowning work of the Redemption that men should be delivered from all lawlessness.⁵ Hatred of lawlessness is quoted by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews as a Messianic attribute in a citation from the 45th Psalm.⁶ It must have been among the bitterest sufferings of the Saviour that He was destined to fulfil the ancient prophecy of being reckoned among the lawless ones⁷; whereas it was indeed by such that He was crucified and slain.⁸ Such is the picture, dark and ominous in its outlines, of lawlessness as it is exposed in the writings of the New Testament.

With no less clearness is exhibited in its pages the opposing concept of Law. Its dignity and force appear to be enhanced by the two-fold source, Hebraistic and Roman, of the idea. The Law was the general title of the Old Testament Scriptures, apart from its subdivisions, it was for the Jew the ascertained will of Jehovah for a Covenant people. The earlier conceptions of Law as understood and enunciated later by jurists were almost as deeply religious as with the Hebrews. No student of Roman jurisprudence can fail to observe how closely its origins are linked with

¹ Rom. iv. 7.

² 2 Cor. vi. 11.

³ Tit. ii. 14.

⁴ St. Luke xxii. 37.

⁵ Rom. vi. 19.

⁶ 1 Thess. ii. 7.

⁷ Heb. i. 9.

⁸ Acts ii. 23.

the worship of the gods. But, while the Law to the Hebrews was intensely national, the sweep of Roman Law was expansive, adapting itself in the Christian even to Imperial needs. The Jew thus rested in the Law as the embodiment of his highest religious privileges, the Roman found in it the security of his political status. In Pauline literature the two conceptions appear to be often blended, and it is a commonplace difficulty with students to ascertain in some characteristic instances which of the two the Apostle has in his mind's eye. There is little doubt, however, that his general conception of Law was vastly enhanced by the addition to his Jewish ideas of all that his conscious acceptance of Roman citizenship brought with it to him in times of stress and need.

Thus students of the New Testament, it is important to observe, are not left with a merely negative idea; for while the character and consequences of lawlessness are pitilessly drawn, they also derive from those same scriptures a Christian conception of Law in general, and laws in particular, intelligible, broad, and dignified. Undoubtedly its breadth and dignity are due to the fact that St. Paul, if not other apostolic writers, did not shrink from superadding all that was just and true in elementary Roman jurisprudence to purely Jewish codes.

Justice has never yet been done to the greatest of English theologians as an interpreter of Scripture. In his first book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* Richard Hooker shows the marvellous sweep and supremacy of Law. Wherever the eye is turned—there Law obtains. In the world of nature, in the world of humanity, among angelic beings, in the divine Society there is alike the presence and operation of Law. Remove Law in any sphere at any point, and there follow inevitably disorder, confusion, chaos. Created matter only continues to exist through it. Human societies suffer quick disintegration without laws. They

are essential to the very welfare of the Church of God. Once more Hooker shows, as with a fine philosophic instinct, so with a reverent appreciation of scriptural teaching, that at the back of all Law, whether natural, human, or ecclesiastical, is God. He sees no other source for Law save the Divine and Eternal Being. "The seat of Law," says he, "lies in the bosom of God."

As in the world of matter, He is the first Great Cause and providential Director, so in the sphere of morals He is the paramount and final authority. This is nothing less than the persistent teaching of Christ and His Apostles. It was pathetically illustrated by them in their attitude towards the civil arm. When any human law violated conscience, then they, as we to-day, were bound to resist.

But it is well to note, at this juncture, with what care and jealousy they observed whether conscience was actually violated by concession, or how far prejudice and antipathies in any crisis were permitted to enter in a sphere from which they should be excluded.¹

Nothing can be more pathetic than the attitude of the early Christians towards the law of the land—the law of Imperial Rome. The final human arbiters of law were a Tiberius or a Caligula—monsters of lust and iniquity. Regarded from this human origin the law which they administered would appear poisoned at its source. The resistance which the early Christians offered was truly passive; it was the resistance not of the arm but of the knee. "I will therefore that prayers and intercessions be made for all men, for kings and all that are in authority,"² the object being that Christian lives might be spent in godliness and quietude.

Herein lies no note of rebellion, no cry of anarchy, but first and foremost a call to prayer, then a counsel of sub-

¹ St. Matt. xvii. 27.

² 1 Tim. ii. 1.

mission when it might be ; or if this might not be, then, but not to be hastily or greedily grasped, the martyr's crown.

No Christian can be a pessimist. There will always be in every Christian heart some echo of the poet's line :

God's above, all's right with the world.

The present time is not worse than the past, but it seems more anxious because more restless. And there certainly is one note of our day which is as ominous as it is audible. There is current to-day not only a contemptuous disregard of Law, but in some quarters an actual hatred of it. The signs of such hatred are patent in almost every department of human life and experience. They are conspicuous in family life. It is difficult sometimes to hold a brief for modern parents. But some externally Christian households seem guided by an inversion of the apostolic precept : " Parents obey your children, for this is just and right." The bitter cry of the superseded father or mother finds expression from time to time in letters, written with a prudent anonymity, to the daily press. Often the correspondents are themselves to blame for the melancholy situation. Yet the experience of the "thankless child," insubordinate, even contemptuously defiant, once rare in our English homes, is not so now. The pain of it, sharper than the serpent's tooth, is wide-felt, and is to-day threatening the welfare of the social fabric, because it weakens it at its base in the family.

Again, there is the question of service.

Here, too, is observed an almost passionate *ἀνομία*, at any rate a deep dislike to the exercise of authority by superiors. This feeling is now so widespread that domestic service appears likely to be revolutionized in England as it already is in the United States. Our young men and women will enter no sphere where they can be described by the hated term "servants." And yet, despite its associ-

ation, that is the title by which the Messiah was prefigured; this the title claimed as one of high dignity by the Apostles of the Lord. Again, the present writer holds no High Tory brief for masters and employers; they have the grave defects of their class; he is only concerned to show that according to New Testament teaching the work done "under authority" is a good and dignified thing, while, according to the spirit of the times, it is irksome and odious.

The issue is still more anxious if one turns to the question of civil rule and authority. For while we are complacently assured that the people of this land are at heart law-abiding, and that the French Revolution could never find a counterpart here, it may be that our department of secret intelligence would have some surprises for us. For lawlessness is in the air, and when it is in the air, the occasion for its exhibition is never far off. The tragedies which within recent history have befallen those uneasy heads that wear the crown of Russia, Italy, and Austria, and still more significantly the heads of the Great Republics of France and the United States, may at any moment, as we open our daily papers, be near us.

Sin is the transgression of the law.

The anxious question for Christian people is whether they may not be making some unconscious contribution to the lawless spirit of the age. If the charge be indignantly denied, there is an aspect of the question which demands a very grave consideration. Most of the readers of this magazine will be in the position not of those who are under authority but of those who daily exercise it. Then, as often as we do not act with absolute fairness, as often as we lack a tender consideration for those over whom we are set in the providence of God, our injustice, or our harshness provokes the very spirit of lawlessness which we deplore.

There is a pregnant phrase which St. Paul often uses when he treats of social life, and the mutual duties which

men owe one to another—as husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant, presbyter and people, ruler and subject. The phrase is “in the Lord.” A devout consideration of its meaning, a steady application of it to the facts of society removes at once the anarchical spirit—and the despotic temper.

All difficulties vanish in the light shed by the one Perfect Example of Him who came not to do His own will, but the will of the Father who sent Him ; and the most momentous truth of the Christian Religion is that its Founder is not only the Pattern of His disciples, but through His Spirit their eternal source of strength.

B. WHITEFOORD

THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF ST. PAUL.

(7) THE ETHICS OF SPEECH.

MR SPURGEON once said that if all men's sins were divided into two bundles half of them would be sins of the tongue. And if anyone had been tempted to retort that in so saying the preacher was himself guilty of one of the sins he was condemning—that, viz., of exaggeration—he might, I think, have pleaded that he had abundant Scripture warrant for his statement. We remember St. James's twofold saying, that “if any stumbleth not in word, the same is a perfect man, able to bridle the whole body also,” but that “if any man thinketh himself to be religious, while he bridleth not his tongue but deceiveth his heart, this man's religion is vain.” And though there be nothing in St. Paul's Epistles quite so downright and outspoken as this, nevertheless by the frequency of his references to the subject and the greater range of his ethical terminology that apostle plainly shows himself to be of the same mind as his brother apostle. A simple catalogue of the many and ugly varieties of the sins of the tongue which St. Paul names is in itself very instructive. Here it is, with its English equivalents as these are given in the Revised Version :—

<i>αἰσχρολογία</i>	shameful speaking (Col. iii. 8).
<i>βλασφημία</i>	railing (Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 4; <i>βλάσφημος</i> , railer or blasphemer, occurs in 1 Tim. i. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 2; <i>βλασφημεῖν</i> frequently).
<i>εὐτραπλία</i>	jesting (Eph. v. 4).
<i>καταλαλιά</i>	backbiting (2 Cor. xii. 20; <i>κατάλαλος</i> , backbiter, occurs in Rom. i. 30).
<i>κραυγή</i>	clamour (Eph. iv. 31).
<i>λόγος σαπρὸς</i>	corrupt speech (Eph. iv. 29).
<i>ματαιολογία</i>	vain talking (1 Tim. i. 6; <i>ματαιολόγος</i> , vain talker occurs in Titus i. 10).
<i>μωρολογία</i>	foolish talking (Eph. v. 4).
<i>πιθανολογία</i>	persuasiveness of speech (Col. ii. 4).

πικρία	bitterness (Rom. iii. 14 ; Eph. iv. 31). ¹
ψεῦδος	falsehood (Eph. iv. 25 ; ψεύστης, liar, occurs in 1 Tim. i. 10 ; and ψευδολόγος, speaking lies, in 1 Tim. iv. 2).
ψιθυρισμός	whispering (2 Cor. xii. 20 ; ψιθυριστής, whisperer, occurs in Rom. i. 30). ²

Such a varied terminology might lead us to anticipate a fuller treatment of the ethics of speech than, as a matter of fact, the Epistles contain. Formal discussion of the subject there is none. Certain sins are named and sharply rebuked as manifestly inconsistent with Christian faith and life, and that is all. Once again we must remind ourselves that St. Paul writes not as a philosopher of morals, but as a preacher of righteousness. His aim is immediate and practical. When he deals with a moral duty his treatment of it is determined not by the place which that duty holds in some rounded system of ethical truth which he has in his mind, but by the circumstances and necessities of the moment. And inasmuch as these papers make no pretence to anything beyond an exposition of the Apostle's own teaching, it follows of necessity that they must partake largely of the unsystematic character which belongs to their subject. In the present paper our aim will be to bring together under convenient categories St. Paul's many precepts concerning the use and misuse of speech. As we shall see, they consist for the most part of stern admonitions against its misuse.

I.

We may take first the Apostle's warnings against idle words, or talkativeness: the disposition, as Butler calls it, to be talking, "abstracted from the consideration of what

¹ In the second of these passages *πικρία* refers rather to the disposition than to the speech in which it finds expression. The use of the word, however, in Rom. iii. 11 justifies its inclusion in this list.

² To these may be added (and even then I am by no means certain that the list is complete): *δίλογος*, double-tongued (1 Tim. iii. 8), *διάβολος*, slanderer (1 Tim. iii. 11 ; 2 Tim. iii. 3 ; Titus ii. 3), and *φλύαρος*, tattler (1 Tim. v. 13).

has to be said ; with very little or no regard to, or thought of doing either good or harm." To this category belong the following three passages :—

1 Tim. v. 13 : " Withal they (the younger widows) learn also to be idle, going about from house to house ; and not only idle, but tattlers (*φλύαροι*) also and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not." *φλύαρος*, says Ellicott, points (as its derivation would suggest) to a babbling, *profluent* way of talking.

In Eph. v. 4, " foolish talking " (*μωρολογία*) is one of the things named as not befitting saints. The word denotes the idle random talk which passes so easily into sin. " It is that talk of fools which is foolishness and sin together." ¹

Eph. iv. 29 : " Let no corrupt speech proceed out of your mouth." It may, perhaps, be thought that this verse belongs rather to one of the following divisions of the paper. There is, however, good reason to believe that the meaning of *σαπρός* here is not " corrupt, putrid," but rather " worthless, good-for-nothing." Corrupt speech St. Paul condemns in the following chapter (v. 4) ; here it is inane, inept, and useless talk against which he sets his face.² Moreover, this is the rendering naturally suggested by the clause which immediately follows.

Talkativeness is one of those habits which few persons are disposed to treat seriously. Great talkers are apt to be great bores, and most of us probably at some time or another have suffered many things at their hands.³ Yet

¹ Trench's *Synonyms*, p. 121.

² " The Greek adjective is the same that is used of the ' *worthless* fruit ' of the ' *worthless* [*good-for-nothing*] tree ' in Matt. xii. 33 ; and again of the ' *bad* fish ' of Matt. xiii. 48, which the fisherman throws away, not because they are corrupt or offensive, but because they are useless for food." (Findlay's *Epistle to the Ephesians*, Expositor's Bible, p. 296.)

³ " I rarely remember," says Swift in his *Hints towards an Essay on Conversation*, " to have seen five persons together where some one among them has not been predominant in the folly of talking too much to the great constraint and disgust of all the rest."

our judgment concerning them rarely goes beyond an expression of personal annoyance, or even a good-natured allusion to So-and-So's "failing." Talkativeness is "bad form"; the great talker is a social pest. Undoubtedly; but at how infinite a remove is all this from the tremendous saying of Jesus, "I say unto you that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." Wherein, then, consists the evil of mere talkativeness? For answer we turn to Bishop Butler and his great sermon "Upon the Government of the Tongue." Butler readily allows that the faculty of speech was given not only to minister to man's need, but also to his enjoyment, and that this its secondary use is in every respect allowable and right. Let men avoid forbidden paths and their conversation may be as free and easy and unreserved as they can desire. But great talkers, people who delight in talking for talking's sake, are always on the edge of saying more than they know, and, as St. Paul says about tattlers and busybodies, of speaking things which they ought not. "And this unrestrained volubility and wantonness of speech is the occasion of numberless evils and vexations in life. It begets resentment in him who is the subject of it; sows the seeds of strife and dissension amongst others; and inflames little disgusts and offences, which if let alone would wear away of themselves: it is often of as bad effect upon the good name of others as deep envy or malice; and, to say the least of it in this respect, it destroys and perverts a certain equity of the utmost importance to society to be observed; viz., that praise and dispraise, a good or bad character, should always be bestowed according to desert. The tongue used in such a licentious manner is like a sword in the hand of a madman; it is employed at random, it can scarce possibly do any good, and for the most part does a world of mischief; and implies not only great folly and a trifling spirit, but

great viciousness of mind, great indifference to truth and falsity, and to the reputation, welfare, and good of others." Wherefore, "let no worthless, good-for-nothing speech proceed out of your mouth."

II.

From much speaking to evil speaking is but a short step down; and on this subject also a little cluster of precepts may be gathered from St. Paul's writings. Twice in the Pastoral Epistles he commands women that they be not "slanderers" (*διαβόλοι*).¹ The word which he uses means literally "devils"; it is the word which has given us our adjective "diabolical"; and verily, there is no temper so wholly unchristian and anti-christian, none that so well deserves the ugly name of "devilish" as the temper of the slanderer and the backbiter.² Again, the Apostle writes: "Put them in mind . . . to speak evil of no man"³; "let all railing (*βλασφημία*) be put away from you,"⁴ and all "shameful speaking (*αἰσχρολογία*) out of your mouth."⁵ *βλασφημία* may be either against God or man, either "blasphemy" or "evil-speaking"; in the passage just quoted it is evidently used in the latter sense. *Αἰσχρολογία* has likewise a twofold meaning: "filthy communication," such as ministers to wantonness, or, more generally, "foul-mouthed abusiveness"; here the wider signification is to be preferred, the term including "every license of the ungoverned tongue employing itself in the abuse of others."⁶

The evils of evil-speaking have been a subject of com-

¹ 1 Tim. iii. 11.; Tit. ii. 3. The word occurs again in 2 Tim. iii. 3.

² Cp. Tennyson's lines—

"Slander, meanest spawn of Hell—
And women's slander is the worst."

³ Tit. iii. 2.

⁴ Eph. iv. 31.

⁵ Col. iii. 8.

⁶ Trench's *Synonyms*, p. 121. See also Ellicott and Lightfoot *in loc.*

ment with moralists of every age. "A backbiting tongue," says the Son of Sirach, "hath disquieted many; strong cities hath it pulled down and overturned the houses of great men." And alas! it is still true that almost wherever two or three are gathered together there is slander in the midst of them, and some absent man's reputation is not safe. There may be no murderous intent in our hearts; we may have as little thought of taking away a man's good name as of taking away his life. But the tide of talk flows on; all listen to it, most join in it, nobody checks it, and in the end the mischief is done as surely as when the garrotter lies in wait for his unsuspecting victim by the wayside. Three things are needed to stay this plague of evil-speaking. First, we must keep in mind Butler's warning against mere talkativeness; for since people cannot go on for ever talking of nothing, when common matters are exhausted, they not unnaturally fly to defamation and scandal and the saying of things which they have no other end in saying except to afford employment to their tongues. Further, as the same wise teacher says, we must learn to get over that strong inclination which most of us have to be talking of the concerns and behaviour of our neighbour. This does not mean that all talk about persons ought to be banished from our tables and firesides; for men and women other men and women must always constitute the main interest of life.¹ The pity of it is that from speech about others which is innocent and edifying we pass so readily to envy and evil-speaking, to slander and miserable, death-dealing detraction. What a continual witness is the bad sense which

¹ Mr. Herbert Spencer does not seem sufficiently to recognize this fact when he declares that "If you want roughly to estimate any one's mental calibre, you cannot do it better than by observing the ratio of generalities to personalities in his talk—how far simple truths about individuals are replaced by truths abstracted from numerous experiences of men and things" (*Study of Sociology*, p. 32).

the word "personalities" now almost always bears to the kind of speech in which we are all apt to indulge once our talk becomes "personal"! For all of us, therefore, Wordsworth's is the safest rule—

"I am not one who oft or much delight
To season my fireside with personal talk.

* * * *

Nor can I not believe but that hereby
Great gains are mine; for thus I live remote
From evil-speaking; rancour never sought
Comes to me not; malignant truth, or lie."¹

And as we speak no slander, so neither must we listen to it. The dealer in scandal gets his license from his hearers; let them withdraw it by refusing to receive his unsavoury wares, and his wretched business will speedily be at an end. We may speak no slander ourselves, but if we give ear to it and credit it, half the sin is ours. No man cares to talk without an audience, and on the day when our ears are shut against the gossip and the tale-bearer, the mouth of them that speak slander will be stopped.

III.

"Corrupt speech" may or may not be the correct translation of the λόγος σαπρὸς which St. Paul forbids in Ephesians iv. 29, but in any case we may accept the phrase as correctly describing another of the varieties of evil speech which he condemns. If the rendering of the Revisers be the right one, we have an interesting parallel in Colossians iv. 6: "Let your speech be always with grace, *seasoned with salt*." The talk of some men has a taint in it like that of meat which has begun to go bad, and part at least of the Apostle's meaning may be: Put that into your speech that will keep it wholesome and

¹ "Let silence be your general rule, or say only that which is necessary and in a few words. . . . Above all avoid speaking of *persons*, either in the way of praise or blame or comparison." (Epictetus.)

fresh. *Αἰσχρολογία* (Col. iii. 8), as we have already seen, denotes speech that is both abusive and foul. *Αἰσχρότης* (Eph. v. 4) is "filthiness" whether of word, gesture, or deed; it includes, though it is not limited to, all indecent talk. But what is the "jesting" which St. Paul joins with this evil company, and condemns as "not befitting"? The word which he uses (*εὐτραπεία*) occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and scarcely admits of exact translation. Let it be said at once, however, that it has nothing to do with the play of pure and wholesome mirth. "The bright flashes of wit and the pleasant gleams of a kindly humour may be as beautiful and as harmless as the play of the sunlight among the trees or on the ripples of a mountain stream." *Εὐτραπεία* means literally, that which easily turns, versatility, nimble-wittedness. Gradually, however, as the faculty was abused, the word took on a darker ethical significance, until it came to denote the low jesting of a clever man, "the wit whose zest lies in its flavour of impurity," "the pleasantry of unclean badinage, of epigrammatic allusion to vice, of half-meanings wholly foul, which defile not only common talk but many a brilliant page of literature." "The jesting which St. Paul describes as 'not befitting,'" is, says Dr. Dale, "the kind of conversation that reaches its perfection in a civilized, luxurious, and brilliant society which has no faith in God, no reverence for moral law, no sense of the grandeur of human life, no awe in the presence of the mystery of death. In such a society, to which the world is the scene of a pleasant comedy in which all men are actors, a polished insincerity and a versatility which is never arrested by strong and immovable convictions are the objects of universal admiration. The foulest indecencies are applauded, if they are conveyed under the thin disguise of a graceful phrase, a remote allusion, an ingenious ambiguity. There is a refinement to which, not vice

itself, but the coarseness of vice is distasteful, and which regards with equal resentment the ruggedness of virtue. This is the kind of jesting that St. Paul so sternly condemns.”¹

IV

There still remain to be dealt with the Apostle's warnings against untruthfulness. “Lie not one to another.”² “Putting away falsehood, speak ye truth each one with his neighbour.”³ “Persuasiveness of speech” (πιθανολογία) meant only to “delude” is a device of the Evil One.⁴ Deacons must not be “double tongued.”⁵ The Apostle himself had a wholesome horror of any suspicion of double-dealing in his own conduct⁶; and in still more emphatic fashion he passes judgment on lying when he places liars side by side with men who are guilty of the foulest and most violent forms of crime: “Law is made for the lawless and unruly, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for fornicators, for abusers of themselves with men, for men-stealers, for *liars*, for false swearers.”⁷

St. Paul does not refer to any of those questions of casuistry which are so often discussed in connexion with this subject, nor is it necessary to refer to them here. They are probably more in evidence in text-books of morals than in real life. From the solemn gravity with which one writer after another discusses what we ought to do if we were questioned by a would-be assassin in search of some one whose whereabouts is known to us, one might think that would-be assassins were lying in wait at every street corner. Neither is it necessary to speak here of the

¹ *Lectures on Ephesians*, p. 331. See on this interesting word Trench's *Synonyms*, p. 121, and Matthew Arnold's *Irish Essays*, etc., p. 135, pop. ed.

² Col. iii. 9.

³ Eph. iv. 25.

⁴ Col. ii. 4.

⁵ 1 Tim. iii. 8.

⁶ 2 Cor. i. 17.

⁷ 1 Tim. i. 9-10.

grosser forms of lying which call forth all but universal condemnation. Mr. P. G. Hamerton's delightful book *Human Intercourse* has a chapter "On an Unrecognised Form of Untruth"; and perhaps the best application for ourselves of St. Paul's exhortation to put away falsehood is in relation to some of those forms of untruthfulness which our conscience is not so quick to recognize and condemn.

To begin with, there is untruthfulness with ourselves. As Butler says, there really is such a thing as plain falsehood and insincerity in men with regard to themselves. We wish naturally enough to stand well with ourselves, and this eager self-interest often blinds us to the truth; we tell lies to ourselves in order to keep up our own good opinion of ourselves. There is indeed no more wily or stubborn foe with which most men have to contend than self-deceit. We manage somehow to go on deceiving ourselves long after others have ceased to be deceived by us. "Who can discern his errors?" Therefore have we need to pray, "Clear and cleanse Thou me from hidden faults," from the faults which are hidden not only from the eyes of men but from my own eyes. For without "truth in the inward parts" it is impossible to please God. Truthfulness with ourselves, it has been well said, is the foundation of all reality in character, as well as the condition of our attaining any other kind of truth.¹

How St. Paul would have judged those easy falsehoods in which, from motives of social convenience, we so often allow ourselves to-day scarcely needs to be pointed out. What short work would he have made of our polite insincerities and the poor pleas with which we strive to defend them! It may be said—it often is said—that these things do no harm, since nobody is deceived by them, and that to speak of them as lies is an offence against that very truth in whose supposed interests they are condemned.

¹ Illingworth's *Christian Character*, p. 111.

But though it be true that our polite fictions deceive nobody, they are not therefore harmless; they harm those who habitually use them. "Their inward reaction is evil. Almost without our being aware of it they may eat into the inward soundness of character. No one can wear repeatedly the habit of affectation before others except at the cost of his own integrity. . . . Let this habit of untruthfulness in little social things and daily affectations of manners, continue, and a wholly unnatural type of character, eaten out with insincerities, may be the result."¹

One of the commonest of these unregarded and unchastised forms of untruth springs from simple inattention and carelessness. A man relates an incident of which he was an eye-witness; but through the inexactness either of his observation or his language his report turns out to be wholly false and misleading. There are persons who possess what has been called "an unveracious mind"; they can never be trusted to see things as they are, or to describe them as they see them. That they have no intent to deceive is true; but this is no sufficient excuse. If we discover that, without our meaning it, words of ours are continually conveying false impressions, we ought to hold ourselves guilty of moral fault and earnestly set ourselves to correct it. The fact is—and it is a fact of which multitudes of people wholly fail to take note—it takes trouble to be truthful. "Speaking truth," says Ruskin, "is like writing fair and comes only by practice; it is less a matter of will than of habit." Our words have to be trained to correspond with our thoughts and our thoughts with facts;

¹ Newman Smyth's *Christian Ethics*, p. 387. Ruskin's vigorous little homily is very much to the point here: "Do not let us lie at all. Do not think of one falsity as harmless, and another as slight, and another as unintended. Cast them all aside: they may be light and accidental; but they are an ugly soot from the smoke of the pit, for all that; and it is better that our hearts should be swept clean of them, without over care as to which is largest or blackest." (*Seven Lamps of Architecture*, ch. ii.)

and this cannot be without long and careful self-discipline. What is needed above all is that we "make conscience" of the whole matter, and think of it with the high seriousness of Jesus: "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned."

Closely akin to the fault just noted is the habit of exaggeration. Once more it may be thought that the evil is a very trifling one, and once more the plea may be urged that it does no harm to others; our "tall talk" may indeed mislead some who do not know us, but by and by our friends come to understand us and themselves to deduct a liberal discount from what we say, and so—what does it matter? But again the question must be asked: Does it matter nothing to ourselves? Is not a regard for the sacredness of truth the chief corner-stone of every true and worthy life; and can any man go on habitually slighting its claims, even in what he thinks a trivial matter, without grave and, it may be, irreparable injury to himself? Even if we leave out of reckoning the loss of influence which every man justly suffers who puts no restraint upon his speech, are there not more inward interests for the sake of which we should watch with a jealous eye every infraction of the great law that word and fact ought always to correspond? To heighten the effectiveness of a story, or to increase the force of an argument, by the addition of some detail furnished not by what we know but only by what we imagine, may seem a very small thing. Perhaps "if we could only see what comes of the difference between exaggeration and truthful self-restraint in the long run," we should judge otherwise.²

¹ Cp. the noble saying of John Davison about some case of prosaic exactness: "It is rather minute accuracy. But I have a respect for all accuracy; for all accuracy is of the noble family of truth, and is to be respected accordingly, even to her most menial servant." (Quoted in Dean Church's *Pascal and other Sermons*, p. 259.)

² See Dean Church's sermon on "Strong Words" in the volume quoted

Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God: it is a very tender and solemn entreaty, and should move us the more when we note the connexion in which it stands. St. Paul has just been warning the Ephesian Christians against idle and good-for-nothing speech, and then he passes straightway to this word of exhortation.¹ When we offend with our tongues we do hurt not only to our brethren and ourselves, we grieve the Holy Spirit of God. It is said that after the deification of the Roman Emperors it was considered impious so much as to use any coarse expression in the presence of their images²; and ought not we Christian men and women so to remember God, and so to keep the door of our lips, that we shall speak no word unworthy of that Presence from which we can never pass?

GEORGE JACKSON.

above. For some interesting remarks on the opposite error—that, viz., of habitual *under*-statement—see Mr. Hamerton's chapter already referred to.

¹ Eph iv. 29, 30.

² Pater's *Marius the Epicurean*, vol. i. p. 17.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE BIBLE.

II.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL (*continued*).

xi. 33b. "It is sometimes argued that religious convictions are not as strong as they were in old times." But "that the fervour for truth is not diminished may be seen in regions outside theology. . . . At this moment hundreds of educated men are defying the whole power of the Russian empire in the struggle for constitutional liberty. Every month sees a score or more of them consigned to a hopeless dungeon or sent to Siberia, and the ranks close up again firmer after every fresh gap. Some of us cannot have forgotten how a crowd of Poles, men and women, knelt down in 1861 in the great square of Warsaw, praying and singing hymns, as fifteen volleys of grape shot tore through their ranks. The sacrifice was unavailing; but it is by sacrifice of this sort that national character is regenerated, and as long as the spirit of martyrdom lives, there seems no need to despair of the future of humanity" (C. H. Pearson).

xi. 35. See Browning's poem, "A Lost Leader."

Even to the time of the end. "In Greek authors of classical times there is no trace of the thought that the human race as a whole, or any single people, is advancing towards a divinely appointed goal; there is nothing of what the moderns mean by the 'Education of the World,' 'the Progress of the Race,' 'the Divine guidance of Nations.' The first germ of the thought is in Polybius¹ (*circa* 204-122 B.C.), whose work illustrates the idea of a providential destiny presiding over the march of Roman history, and building up the imperial power of Rome for the good of

¹ i.e. a contemporary of the prophet who wrote the book of Daniel (J. M.).

mankind " (Butcher's *Aspects of the Greek Genius*, pp. 155-156).

xi. 36 f. " Others may occupy themselves, if they will, in seeking a nostrum to destroy the phylloxera ; be it mine to find one that shall destroy the Christian religion " (M. Paul Bert).

" Can there be a more dreadful delusion than to see God where He is not, or to imagine ourselves more enlightened than Jesus Christ ? " (Dr. William Barry).

xi. 43-45. " I can never forget the inexpressible luxury and prophanesne, gaming and all dissoluteness, and as it were total forgetfulness of God (it being Sunday evening) which this day se'nnight I was witness of, the king sitting and toying with his concubines, a French boy singing love songs, in that glorious gallery, whilst about 20 of the greatest courtiers and other dissolute persons were at Bassett round a large table, a bank of at least 2,000 in gold before them, upon which two gentlemen who were with me made reflexions with astonishment. Six days after was all in the dust ! " (Evelyn's *Diary*, Feb. 1685).

xii. 3. " I do believe the station of a popular preacher is one of the greatest trials on earth : a man in that position does not stop to soberly calculate how much, or rather how little is done when there appears a great effect, nor to consider how immense is the difference between deeply affecting the feelings and permanently changing the heart. The preacher who causes a great sensation and excited feelings is not *necessarily* the one who will receive the reward of shining as the stars for ever and ever, because he has turned many to righteousness " (F. W. Robertson).

xii. 3. " Yonder stars are rising. Have you ever noticed their order, heard their ancient names, thought of what they were, as teachers, 'lecturers,' in that large public hall of the night, to the wisest men of old ? Have you ever thought of the direct promise to you yourselves,

that you may be like them if you will? 'They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars, for ever and ever.' They that be *wise*. Don't think that means knowing how big the moon is. It means knowing what you ought to do, as man or woman; what your duty to your father is, to your child, to your neighbour, to nations your neighbours" (Ruskin, *Fors Clavigera*, lxxv.).

"I like to associate my friends with particular stars, there is something so sweet and intimate and confidential in a star. The sun and the moon, but especially the sun, are too universal and general for particular friendship; but you may consider a star as your own" (Erskine of Linlathen).

xii. 4. "The art of printing appears to have been providentially reserved till these latter ages, and then providentially brought into use, as what was to be instrumental for the future in carrying on the appointed course of things. The alterations which this art has already made in the face of the world are not inconsiderable. By means of it, whether immediately or remotely, the methods of carrying on business are, in several respects, improved, *knowledge has been increased*, and some sort of literature is become general" (Butler).

xii. 4, 9. "My book will await its reader; has not God waited 6,000 years before He has created a man to contemplate His works?" (Kepler).

xii. 10. *They that be wise*. "God will not judge men by what they know; yet to have used knowledge rightly will be a staff to support and comfort us in passing through the dark valley" (Jowett).

xii. 13. *For thou shalt rest*. "Nature in her grave nobleness is not less, but more dear now, when I remember that I shall soon bid her good even, to enter into the

presence of her Lord and mine. New heavens and a new earth—I cannot sever my human heart from mine own land ; and who shall say that those noble countries, casting off all impurity in the fiery trial that awaits them, shall not be our final heaven ?

“ I love to think that it may be so ; I love to think that the Lord, in his humanity, looks tenderly upon the mortal soil on which he sojourned in his wondrous life, and that here, perchance, in these very lands, made holy by his grace and power, our final rest shall be. It may be but a fancy ; but it comes upon me with gentle might, like the whispered comfort of an angel. A new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness—a glorified humanity which, remaining human, is mortal no longer ! with the judgment and the condemnation and the wars of the Lord overpast, and the earth and the heaven one fair broad country, and Himself over all, blessed for ever ! These are the old man’s dreams ; and they shed new glory over the pleasant places in which my lines have fallen ” (From *Adam Graeme of Mossgray*, by Mrs. Oliphant).

“ Spare no deceit. Lay the sword upon it ; go over it : keep yourselves clear of the blood of all men, either by word or writing ; and keep yourselves clean, that you may stand in your throne, and everyone have his lot, and stand in the lot in the Ancient of Days ” (Fox’s *Address to the Quakers*, 1656).

Thou shalt rest.—

“ Brother, we do not lay you down so deep
But we ourselves shall overtake you soon :
We dream a little longer, while you sleep ;
And sleep than dreaming, yours the better boon.

Who sleeps not and is thankful when he can ?

In dreaming there is little rest, be still.

We are but oxen of the Husbandman,

In his good time we sow what seed he will.

Till Earth put out her dead like buds in spring,
 'Twere well to sleep the whole black winter through.
 Sweetly the cool earth round your ears shall cling;
 We turn to dreams again; sleep soundly, you."

(Prof. J. S. Phillimore.)

ADDENDA.

ii. 40. *The fourth kingdom . . . shall break in pieces and crush.*

"Let's have no more dominant races; we don't want them; they only turn men into insolent brutes" (Burne-Jones).

iii. 15.

"I saw an Image, all of massie gold,
 Placed on high upon an altare faire,
 Not all, which did the same from farre beholde,
 Might worship it, and fall on lowest staire.
 Not that great Idol might with this compaire,
 To which th' Assyrian tyrant would have made
 The holie brethren falslie to have praid."

—(Spenser's *The Ruines of Time*.)

iv. 4-5. *I, Nebuchadnezzar, was at rest in mine house, and flourishing in my palace. I saw a dream which made me afraid.*

"Remember," wrote Mr. F. W. H. Myers to a friend, "that first of all a man must have, from the torpor of a foul tranquility, his soul *delivered unto war*."

iv. 27. *Wherefore, O king, break off thine . . . iniquities by showing mercy to the poor.*

"Poor naked wretches, wheresoe'er you are,
 That bide the pelting of this pitiless storm,
 How shall your houseless heads and unfed sides,
 Your loop'd and window'd raggedness, defend you
 From seasons such as these? O I have ta'en
 Too little care of this! Take physic, pomp;
 Expose thyself to feel what wretches feel."

—(The King in *King Lear*, Act iii. Scene 4.)

"A decent provision for the poor is the true test of civilization" (Dr. Johnson).

iv. 28. *All this came upon the king Nebuchadnezzar.*

"Express confessions give definiteness to memories that might more easily melt away without them" (George Eliot).

v. 1-17. "From the words of Daniel it appears that Belshazzar had made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand. The golden and silver vessels are gorgeously enumerated, with the princes, the king's concubines, and his wives. Then follows—'In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the *king* saw the part of the hand that wrote. Then the *king's* countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosened, and his knees smote one against another.' This is the plain text. By no hint can it be otherwise inferred, but that the appearance was solely confined to the fancy of Belshazzar, that his single brain was troubled. Not a word is spoken of its being seen by any one else there present, not even by the queen herself, who merely undertakes for the interpretation of the phenomena as related to her, doubtless, by her husband. The lords are simply said to be astonished; i.e. at the trouble and change of countenance in their sovereign. Even the prophet does not appear to have seen the scroll which the king saw. He recalls it only. He speaks of the phantom as past." From Charles Lamb's essay on *The Barrenness of the Imaginative Faculty in the productions of modern art*.

v. 22. *Thou hast not humbled thine heart.* The late Mr. F. W. H. Myers, speaking of his early passion for the classics, confesses that they "were but intensifications of my own being. They drew from me and fostered evil as

well as good; they might aid imaginative impulse and detachment from sordid interests, but they had no check for pride."

v. 25 f. In describing the squalor of Vauxhall Walk, Lambeth, Wilkie Collins observes that "in this district, as in other districts remote from the wealthy quarters of the metropolis, the hideous London vagabond—with the filth of the street outmatched in his talk, with the mud of the street out-dirtied in his clothes—lounges, lowering and brutal, at the street corner and the gin-shop door; the public disgrace of his country, the unheeded warning of social troubles that are yet to come. Here the loud assertion of Modern Progress—which has reformed so much in manners, and altered so little in man—meets the flat contradiction that scatters its pretensions to the winds. Here, while the national prosperity feasts, like another Belshazzar, on the spectacle of its own magnificence, is the writing on the wall, which warns the monarch, Money, that his glory is weighed in the balance, and his power found wanting" (From *No Name*, Scene Three, chap. i.).

JAMES MOFFATT.

(*To be continued.*)

THE WORSHIP OF THE VIRGIN MARY AT EPHESUS.¹

III. EARLY WORSHIP OF THE MOTHER OF GOD IN EPHESUS.

THE Ephesian tradition has all the appearance of being a popular growth, frowned on at first by the Church, and never fully and cordially accepted, but only permitted as a concession to popular feeling. The Orthodox Church gained the general support of the populace in the fifth century by tacitly (or even sometimes openly) permitting the reinvigoration of the old paganism under outwardly Christianized forms, and freed from the most debasing elements and accretions which were attached to it in former times, but which formed no essential part of it. The people longed for those impersonations of the deepest principles of human life and society, which had been to them of old gods and guides. The Divine Mother, the God-Son, were ideas that came close to the popular nature and lay deep in the popular heart, and the purely Christian ethics and theology were too remote and incomprehensible to insufficiently educated minds. The old paganism, amid much that was ugly and hateful, had contained in its hieratic forms much of the gradually elaborated wisdom of the race. The rules of worship and

¹ I am indebted to my friend and old pupil, Professor A. Souter, of Mansfield College, for much help and all the quotations which are here printed. The article had to be written far from books during the journey, in the course of which I visited Ephesus at the beginning of May 1905.

ritual were the rules of useful practical life and conduct in the family and society. The ugliest part was mere degeneration and degradation.¹ The earlier steps in this recrudescence of pagan ideas in the Christian Church of Asia (a growth which was vainly, and not always wisely or rightly, resisted by the various Iconoclastic sects) cannot now be traced. In the fifth century the traces become clear and evident: in the fourth century they can be guessed.

The oldest allusion to the worship of the Virgin Mary at Ephesus as already an established cult (perhaps the earliest² in the whole of Anatolia) is contained in the Acts of the Council which met at Ephesus in 431 A.D.³ The sermon, which had been preached by Proclus, bishop of Cyzicus, in 429, is incorporated in the record of the Council; and this fact seems to show that the proceedings and the sermon must be read in the light of each other. The sermon was considered to be a fair statement of the view which the Council regarded as right. Thus we must interpret the formal business of the Synod, which was held in "the church called Maria." The very existence of a church bearing that name is in itself a proof of an already established cult in Ephesus. The Synod was called as a protest against the depreciation of the worship of the Virgin Mother of God by Nestorius and his followers.

Theodosius II. had summoned Nestorius from Syrian Antioch to be patriarch of Constantinople; and he brought

¹ This is a brief, and therefore too dogmatic and harsh, *résumé* of the thesis which was gradually worked out in the process of writing the article on *Religion of Greece and Asia Minor* in Hastings' *Dictionary*, vol. v.

² The allusion in the epitaph of Avireius Marcellus (St. Abercius), c. A.D. 192, shows great respect for her, and places her relation to Jesus among the most sacred and fundamental articles of the Christian faith; but that stage is already clearly marked in the letters of Ignatius.

³ Several extracts from the exordium of this sermon have been quoted on pages 409 f.; for the complete sermon, see Migne *P. G.* lxx. p. 680 ff.

with him Anastasius, a presbyter of Antioch. The latter in a sermon had declared that the title "Mother of God" ought not to be applied to Mary, inasmuch as God cannot be born of woman; Mary was the mother only of the man Jesus, while the divine Jesus was the Son of God alone. Mary, as he said, was only the mother of Christ, not Mother of God (Christotokos, not Theotokos). The orthodox majority of the Church rose in horror against this duplication of the person of Christ, and condemned the authors at the Council of Ephesus. Along with this condemnation it was inevitable that the actual worship of the Virgin Mother of God (as she was now officially called) received new strength in the popular mind, as if it had been now formally sanctioned.

It may be regarded as possible that the name attached in Ephesus to the church called "Maria," was popular rather than official.¹ The expression used strongly indicates this; and no other origin for the name seems possible. The church was in 431 B.C. not "the church of Maria," or "dedicated to her"; it was "the church called Maria." Probably the full expression of the meaning of the Greek would be "the church (of God) which bears the name Maria." Popular feeling attached the name, and gave its own character to the worship; but the official, or sacerdotal, view did not formally recognize this, though it went a long way in making concession to it, and in practice apparently gave almost full freedom to it. Where a strong popular feeling is concerned, the Council which condemned the one great opponent of that feeling, and formally authorized, as binding on all Christians, one expression of that feeling (viz. the expression "Mother of God"), must be regarded as tacitly permitting those other expressions, public at the time, which it did not condemn. It is of course certain that afterwards the dedication to the Virgin

¹ ἐν τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Μαρίας.

Mary of this and other churches was fully accepted by the priesthood and by most of the Church leaders.

It may be noted here in passing that the recent Austrian excavations have strongly confirmed the opinion¹ that the "church called Maria," in Ephesus, is to be found in the double church whose remains must be familiar to all visitors to the ruins, as they are among the loftiest and most imposing buildings on the site. In a visit to Ephesus in May 1905 the present writer was informed that the eastern church in this connected pair, which is the later of the two, has been found to be of the age of Justinian, that the older western half was almost certainly in existence before 431, that it was dedicated to the Virgin, and that Mr. Heberdey, the distinguished director of the Austrian enterprise, considered it to be the church in which the council was held. It remains uncertain as yet whether the eastern church also was dedicated to her.

It was only during the fourth century that the leaders or the great writers of the Christian Church seem to have begun to interest themselves in the story of the life of the Virgin Mary for her own sake. Epiphanius about 375 A.D. remarks that the Scriptures say nothing about the death of the Virgin, whether she died or not, whether she was buried or not, and that in the Scriptures there is no authority for the opinion that when John went away into (the Province) Asia, he took her with him.²

But from these words of Epiphanius it seems clear and

¹ This opinion is, if I am not mistaken, expressed in my *Letters to the Seven Churches*; but at the moment of writing I have not access to a copy of the book. The opinion was certainly in my mind, but may perhaps have been cut out of the proof sheets as too conjectural. [It is stated in the writer's article on *Ephesus* in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, but not in the *Letters to the Seven Churches*.]

² Epiph. *adv. Haer.* III., 1, haer. 78. § 11 (Migne *P. G.* xlii. 716b): 'Ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰ δοκοῦσί τινες ἐσφάλθαι, ζητήσωσι τὰ ἔχνη τῶν γραφῶν, καὶ εὕρωσιν ἂν οὔτε θάνατον Μαρίας, οὔτε εἰ τέθνηκεν, οὔτε εἰ μὴ τέθνηκεν, οὔτε εἰ τέθαπται, οὔτε εἰ μὴ τέθαπται. Καίτοι γε τοῦ Ἰωάννου περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐνστελεμένου τὴν πορείαν, καὶ οὐδαμῶς λέγει ὅτι ἐπηγάγετο μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον κτλ.

certain that popular tradition had already before his time been busy with her later life. Starting from the one recorded fact that she remained until her death under the care and keeping of St. John, it had woven into this something in the way of an account of her death, and the circumstances connected with it and with the burial. Doubtless it had interwoven some marvellous incidents in the story; and it would be possible to guess how these originated and were gradually elaborated. But the one thing that concerns our purpose is that Epiphanius must have known of the story that the Virgin had gone with St. John to Ephesus; otherwise he would not have taken the trouble to deny that it rested on any scriptural foundation. The popular tradition in Asia is therefore as old at least as the middle of the fourth century. And, whereas in the fifth century the Church leaders (as we have already seen) in the time of the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, refrained from either contradicting or confirming expressly the popular Ephesian belief, Epiphanius in the fourth century points out that this and all other stories about her death and burial were devoid of authoritative foundation. We are in presence of a popular belief, disclaimed and set aside as valueless in the fourth century, but treated with more careful respect, though not confirmed, in the fifth century. The sacerdotal teaching could not admit the popular belief as authoritative, but it tacitly permitted the belief to reign in the popular mind, and to govern popular action and religion, in the same way as it gradually came to acquiesce, without either affirmation or denial, in most of the popular local cults of saints.

This Ephesian tradition has continued in effective operation to the present day. When the Roman Catholic discoverers of the "House" of the Virgin began to inquire into the situation, they found that the Greeks of Kirkindje, a village among the hills south-east of Ephesus, to which

the remnants of the Christian population are said to have retired in the middle ages, regarded the place as sacred, called it Panagia Kapuli,¹ and held certain annual ceremonies there. Since the Catholics made the discovery, they have bought a large tract of ground round the ruin; and the Greeks have in some degree lost their devotion to the spot. An English lady, however, who speaks Greek as fluently as she does English, told me that she asked the Greek servant who guided her to the Panagia Kapuli whether the Orthodox Christians² held a Panegyris at this place. He replied that they had no Panegyris there, but only a Litourgia; and that in case of trouble or sickness it was customary to take a priest to the place and perform service and offer prayers there. The annual ceremony, therefore, seems to have been abandoned, though popular belief still clings to the holy place, and attracts to it those who are in trouble. But the Greek priests appear not to have held, and certainly now they utterly disclaim, the belief that the Panagia herself ever was there; and they maintain that this house is only a ruined little church dedicated to her.

As to the ruins, the photographs show clearly a small mediaeval building, with an apse. One would unhesitatingly set it down as a mediaeval church, for the religious needs of the population of the secluded glen in which it is situated.

By an unfortunate accident at Ephesus I was prevented from visiting the Panagia Kapuli, after all arrangements had been made; and, while others went, I had to rest in the house for two days. But, as I understand, a friend of trained and practised experience in archæological research

¹ Kapuli is a Turkish word, "possessed of or connected with a door."

² In strict Greek expression "Christians" are the Orthodox alone; other sects are Catholics, Protestants, Armenians, etc., but none of these are in popular phraseology denominated Christians.

considers that part of the building is older than the walls generally, and might date from as early as the first century.

The glen in which the building is situated is divided from the city of Ephesus by a high, jagged ridge of mountain, along the crest of which ran the south wall of the Grecian city, built by Lysimachus about 280 B.C. This part of the wall is still fairly well preserved: its lofty position and remoteness from the haunts of men have saved it from destruction at the hands of mediæval or modern builders.

IV. THE VISION OF ANNE CATHARINE EMMERICH.

Now arises the question how far any value as evidence can be set on the vision of the German nun, Anne Catharine Emmerich. In the first place, I should repeat what was already stated in Part I. of this article, that it seems unjustifiable to throw doubt on the honest intentions both of the seer and of the reporter, the poet Brentano. After fully weighing all the evidence, I do not entertain the smallest doubt that she saw those visions or dreams, and that they have been faithfully reported to us. The visions are exactly what a nun in such surroundings as Anne Catharine's would think, and ought to think. But they lie almost wholly within the narrowest circle of commonplace mediæval pseudo-legend, hardly worthy to be called legendary, because it is all so artificial.

The experience of a foreign friend whose name (if I were free to mention it) would be a certificate of wide reading and literary power, narrated to me by him some years ago, illustrates the probable bent of Anne Catharine's mind. His family travelled for some time in the company of a lady educated in a convent: her conversation generally showed quite remarkable lack of knowledge or interest, but in picture-galleries she displayed an equally remarkable familiarity with lives of the saints, identifying at a glance

every picture relating to them, telling the story connected with each sacred picture in the fullest detail, and explaining numerous little points about the symbolism, which might escape even well-informed observers.

In hurriedly reading over the visions about the life of the Virgin in a French translation, while I was visiting Ephesus in the beginning of May 1905, I have observed only two points which seem to lie outside of this narrow circle.

One of these is the date of the birth of Christ. It is not fixed at Christmas, but on the 24th November. I do not know how far this divergence may be connected with any stories or legends likely to be within the ordinary circle of knowledge of a German nun, of humble origin and without any special education, at the beginning of the nineteenth century. But it seems not at all impossible or improbable that she may have come in contact with educated persons, or may have learned in other ways so much of the results of historical investigation as to hear that there is no substantial foundation for the common ceremonial practice of celebrating the birth of Christ at the end of December.

The other and by far the most interesting passage in the whole book is the minutely detailed account of the home of the Virgin and the small Christian settlement in the neighbourhood of Ephesus. It is worth quotation in full.

“After the Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, Mary lived three years on Sion, three years at Bethany, and nine years at Ephesus, to which place John had conducted her shortly after the Jews had exposed Lazarus and his sisters on the sea.

“Mary did not live exactly at Ephesus, but in the environs, where were settled already many women who were her friends. Her dwelling was situated three leagues and a half from Ephesus, on a mountain which was seen to the left in coming from Jerusalem, and which rapidly descended towards Ephesus—coming from the south-east

the city was seen as if altogether at the foot of a mountain, but it is seen to extend all round as you continue to advance. Near Ephesus there are grand avenues of trees, under which the yellow fruits are lying on the ground. A little to the south, narrow paths lead to an eminence covered with wild plants. There is seen an undulating plain covered with vegetation, which has a circuit of half a league; it is there that this settlement was made. It is a solitary country, with many small, agreeable and fertile elevations, and some grottoes hollowed in the rock, in the midst of little sandy places. The country is rough without being barren; there are here and there a number of trees of pyramidal form with smooth trunks, whose branches overshadow a large space.

“When St. John conducted to this spot the Blessed Virgin, for whom he had already erected a house, some Christian families and many holy women were already residing in this country. They were living, some under tents, others in caves, which they had rendered habitable by the aid of carpentry and wainscoting. They had come here before the persecution had burst forth with full force. As they took advantage of the caves which they found there, and of the facilities which the nature of the places offered, their dwellings were real hermitages, often separated a quarter of a league from each other; and this kind of colony presented the appearance of a village with its houses scattered at a considerable distance from each other. Mary’s house stood by itself, and was constructed of stone. At some distance behind the house the land rises and proceeds across the rocks to the highest point of the mountain, from the top of which, over the small elevations and trees, the city of Ephesus is visible,¹ with

¹ [Some words are omitted here (by the fault of either translator or transcriber): the text should be to the effect, “and the sea with its numerous islands.”]

its numerous islands. The place is nearer the sea than Ephesus itself, which lies at some distance. The country is solitary and little frequented. In the neighbourhood was a castle, occupied, if I mistake not, by a deposed king. St. John visited him frequently, and converted him. This place became, later on, a bishopric. Between this dwelling of the Blessed Virgin and Ephesus a river flowed, winding in and out with innumerable turnings.”¹

What value can be set upon this extremely interesting passage?

It is unnecessary to do more than mention the impossibility of the assumption made in the vision that St. John could have gone to Ephesus in the sixth year after the Crucifixion and found there already a Christian community.² But it might quite fairly and reasonably be argued by any defender of the general trustworthiness of the nun's visions, that in regard to numbers and estimates of time and distance her evidence stands on a less satisfactory basis than in other more important respects. Her statements of distance seem to be only conjectural estimates according to the appearance presented in her vision, and therefore stand as it were outside of the vision as being her own opinion about what she saw. The lapse of years was expressed as part of the visions: she saw the numbers of years presented to her eyes in Roman figures,³ and in relating what she had seen she stated

¹ *The Death of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and Her Assumption into Heaven, containing a Description of Her House at Ephesus, recently discovered. From the Meditations of Anne Catherine Emmerich. Translated from the French.* By George Richardson (Dublin: Duffy and Co., 1897), pp. 1-4.

² At this time, too, Thomas is said to have already evangelized India and Bactria, Philip Egypt, James Spain, etc.

³ The editor of the French translation mentions this in a footnote, and explains the discrepancy between two statements about the time of the Virgin's residence at Jerusalem (which is given as four years in one passage, and six in another) as due to Anne Catharine's unfamiliarity with Roman symbols, which caused to confuse between iv. and vi.

that she saw a V. with a I. beside it which she understood to mean six, viz. the number of years that the Virgin remained in (or near) Jerusalem after the Crucifixion. Such a defender might point out that the Virgin is described as being in extreme old age, and yet the years of her life are stated as sixty-four; and he might fairly argue that a healthy Jewess of sixty has not the appearance of extreme age, and that the numbers must therefore be regarded on a secondary plane, so that St. John's journey to Ephesus with her can be placed at a reasonable and possible date, later than the formation of a Christian Church in Ephesus, and probably even later than the death of St. Paul, when the Virgin Mary was a very old woman, over ninety years of age.

That seems a quite fair method of interpretation; but though it avoids chronological difficulties, it leaves others untouched. The idyllic picture of the Christians living in a little community of their own away from the city, apart from the ways of men, separate from their pagan fellow-townsmen, is the dream that springs from a mind moulded by monastic habits and ideas, but is as unlike as can be to the historic facts. Had Christianity begun by retiring out of the world, it would never have conquered the world. Every inquirer into history knows that the Christians of that first period were involved in the most strenuous and crowded struggle of life. The nun's vision is a picture of quiet seclusion and peace. This alone is sufficient to show that the vision has a purely subjective origin.

Still more evident is the nature of the vision, when we consider the localities described. The minuteness of detail with which the description is given stands in remarkable contrast to the rest of the book. There is a clear conception of the approach from Jerusalem (through the Mæander valley and) across the mountains, reaching

Ephesus from the south-east. The view of the city, as one comes near it, is very beautiful; and the description in the vision, though rather general in its character, is quite good, except in three important respects.¹

In the first place, at a distance of three leagues and a half no view of the city can possibly be got; the road at that point is still entirely secluded among the mountains: only when one comes within about two or three miles of the south-eastern gate of Ephesus, the Magnesian gate, does the city come into view.

In the second place, there is not at any point on the road, or near it on the left, this complete view of the city as a whole. From any such point considerable part of the city is hidden behind Mount Pion. This complete view can be obtained only by approaching from the north, as modern travellers and tourists do in almost every case.

In the third place, a winding river is described as running between the approaching travellers and the city. This winding river is the Cayster, now called the Menderez (i.e. Mæander). Its course is quite as circuitous and tortuous as the vision represents it; but it is hardly visible from the south-eastern road, or from a point on the left hand of that road. It is only as one comes from the north that this river and its wanderings form so striking a part of the scene; and further, one must come over the higher ground in order to get the view perfectly. Moreover, this mæandering river runs on the north side of the city; so that only to the traveller coming from the north does it flow between him and the city.

In the fourth place there are not at the present day

¹ The plan of Ephesus in the writer's *Letters to the Seven Churches* will make the following paragraphs clearer.

[Reading over this extract from the English translation, as it has been inserted in the proof sheets by the care of Mr. Souter, I feel that it gives a different impression from the French translation, which I read at

numerous islands¹ visible from the peak above Kapuli Panagia. Samos shuts out the view of those beyond it. But in ancient times there were several islets in the gulf of Ephesus (which is now silted up and converted into solid land or marsh), so that the ancient state of things was less unfavourable to the nun's description than the modern state is. It is however uncertain whether the islets in the gulf would be visible from the peak: this point has never been investigated.

It seemed beyond doubt or question to me, as I sat in the Ephesian plain and read the description, that the whole has taken its origin from a description given by some traveller or tourist of his approach to Ephesus. How this came to Anne Catharine's knowledge is uncertain; but there seems no difficulty in supposing that some traveller or some reader of a printed description had talked to her (she is said not to have been a reader); and the narrative had sunk into her mind and moulded quite unconsciously the vision that she saw. Only the appearance from a rising-ground on the north is inaccurately represented as seen by the traveller coming from the south-east. There is, thus, a curious mixture of accuracy and inaccuracy. St. John approaches, as he would in fact do, from the south-east; but he sees the view that would be presented to a traveller coming from the north, who diverged a little from the low road to a rising-ground, or who approached by a path through the hills.

Again, it is a detail which at first sight seems very impressive that the travellers approaching from the south-east diverged a little from the road towards the left and there found the small Christian community. In such a

Ephesus. I have not the opportunity of comparing the two; but the English (published after the discovery of the House) is more in accordance with the localities than the French (published before) seemed to be.]

¹ The expression in the French translation, I think, is *innombrables*.

situation, some miles off to the left, the so-called "House" of the Virgin was found by the Catholic explorers. This "House" lies among the mountains in a secluded glen, divided by the high ridge of Mount Coressus from the city; and beyond doubt no modern traveller had ever penetrated into those mountains away from the regular paths, until the Catholic explorers went to seek for the "House" and found it beside the spring.

It is also a striking point that there is a peak over the "House," and that this peak is nearer the sea than Ephesus is, just as the vision has it; but from the peak one sees (as I am informed by several visitors) only the site of the temple of Diana outside the city, together with the Magnesian gate and the walls on the highest ridge of Coressus, while the city as a whole is hidden behind Coressus.

In short, the view of the city which is described in the vision is plainly and certainly the view got from a ledge or shelf on the hills that bound the valley, where they slope down towards the city and the plain, and not from a point shut off from most of the plain by a lofty ridge of mountains. A continuous slope with an uninterrupted view down over the city is described in the vision; and one could almost look to identify the shelf that is described, were it not that such a feature can be found in almost any similar sloping hillside.

It is needless to touch on the supposed correspondence between the shape and interior arrangements of the "House" and those described in the vision. To the nun it seemed clear that the Virgin must have lived and died in a building of the nature and shape of a church, having an apse: she had acquired sufficient knowledge of the form of the eastern churches. It cannot be doubted that the mind of the person who saw those visions was fixed steadily on those subjects; and I cannot but think that she

must have often conversed and asked about eastern places and things, and that from the little knowledge she thus acquired, combined with her training in the mediæval western legends of the saints and the Holy Family, the visions gradually took their form without conscious effort on her part.

V. CONCLUSION.

We have thus arrived at the result, first, that the Ephesian belief as to the residence of the Virgin Mary in their city, though existing at least as early as the fourth century, rests on no recorded authority, but was a purely popular growth, and is therefore possessed of no more credibility than belongs to the numberless popular legends, which everywhere grow up in similar circumstances; and, secondly, that the nun's vision, interesting as it is, furnishes no real evidence.

The Roman Catholic writer ¹ of a book already quoted, *Panaghia-Capouli*, p. 90, while fully admitting that the entire body of Greek clerical opinion has been against that Ephesian tradition, argues that a tradition which persists in the popular mind through the centuries, in spite of the contrary teaching of the clergy, is likely to rest on a real foundation.

We can only repeat what has been shown in detail in Section II., that numberless examples can be quoted of the growth of such popular beliefs without any historical foundation. They spring from the nature of the human mind; and they prove only the vitality of the old religious ideas.

¹ Though it has no bearing on the question of credibility, it is right to guard against the impression that general Roman Catholic opinion is in favour of the Ephesian tradition. The ruling opinion in Roman Catholic circles is against it; but as a rule the Catholics of the Smyrna district favour it.

Take an example which came to my knowledge after the former part of this paper was printed. Three or four miles south of Pisidian Antioch we found in a village cemetery an altar dedicated to the god Hermes. On the top of the altar there is a shallow circular depression, which must probably have been intended to hold liquid offerings poured on the altar, and which was evidently made when the altar was constructed and dedicated. A native of the village, who was standing by, as we copied the inscription, told us that the stone was possessed of power, and that if any one who was sick came to it and drank of the water that gathered in the cup, he was cured forthwith of his sickness. This belief has lasted through the centuries; it has withstood the teaching and denunciation of Christians and Mohammedans alike; but it is not therefore possessed of any real foundation. It springs from the superstitious nature of the popular mind, and the stubborn persistence of the old beliefs. You may in outward appearance convert a people to a new and higher faith; but if they are not educated up to the level of intellectual and moral power which that higher faith requires, the old ideas will persist in the popular mind, all the stronger in proportion to the ignorance of each individual; and those ideas will seize on and move the people especially in cases of trouble and sickness and the presence or dread of death.

Such is the nature of the Ephesian tradition. The Virgin Mother in Ephesus had been worshipped from time immemorial; and the people could not permanently give her up. They required a substitute for her, and the Christian Mother of God took her place, and dwelt beside her in the hearts of the people. This belief soon created a locality for itself, for the Anatolian religion always found a local home. The home was marked out at Ortygia in the mountains on the south of the Ephesian valley, where the pagan Virgin Artemis was born, and where probably her

original home had been, until she as the great Queen-bee led her mourning people to their new home in the valley by the shore of the sea¹ and became the "goddess and mother and queen" of Ephesus. The Christian worship of the Virgin Mother seems to have originated at so early a period that it could not establish itself directly on the home of the older Virgin Artemis. It could only seek a neighbouring home in the same hilly country a little further eastwards. When this home was found for the new belief, a sacred legend inevitably grew up around it according to the usual process in the popular religion of antiquity. The legend had to be adapted to the Christian history. It could not imitate exactly the pagan legend that the Virgin was born at Ortygia; but the belief that the Mother of God had lived in old age and died there, grew up and could readily be adapted to the record.

It will always remain a question, as to which opinions will differ widely, how far it is right or permissible to make concessions to so deep-seated a feeling as that belief must have been. On the one hand, a concession which takes the form of an unhistorical legend and a ceremonial attached to a false locality will meet with general disapproval. On the other hand, it seems certain that injudicious proselytising combined with wholesale condemnation and uprooting of popular beliefs has often done much harm in the history of Christianity. The growing experience and wisdom of primitive races wrought out certain rules of life, of sanitation, purity, consideration for the community, and many other steps in civilization; and these rules were placed under the Divine guardianship, because there was no other way of enforcing them on all. Practical house-

¹ *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 217. On the map there Ortygia, which lies really outside of the limits of the map, is indicated wrongly. It was necessary to put in the name, but the actual locality is a little south-east of the place where the name stands.

hold wisdom was expressed in the form of a system of household religious rites. It is true that these rules were often widened by false analogy, and applied in ways that were needless and useless; but there remained in them the residuum of wisdom and usefulness.¹ It has often been an unwise and almost fatal error of Christian missionaries (an error recognized and regretted by many of them in recent time) to treat all these rules as superstitious and try to eradicate them before any system of habitual good conduct in society and ordinary life had been settled and rooted in the minds of proselytes.

That the belief in the Mother, and especially the Virgin Mother, as the teacher, guide, and nourisher of her people, was capable of infinite expansion as a purifying and elevating principle, has been shown in Section I. That it has been of immense influence on Asia Minor is patent in the history of the country; even Turkish Conquest, though it attained its purposes by general massacre especially of the male population, has not wholly eradicated it. That it is a principle which belongs to a settled and peaceful age and state of society, and that it must be weakened in a state of war and disorder, is evident in itself, and has been shown in detail elsewhere.²

The vision of the nun in Westphalia and the rediscovery of the House of the Virgin form simply an episode in the history of that religious principle, and a proof of its vitality.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ See *Religion of Greece and Asia Minor* in Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, v. 133. and *passim*. The process of degradation constantly came in to make these rules deteriorate, as is shown in that article.

² See the article quoted in the preceding footnote.

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF 2 THESSALONIANS
II. 1-12.

IN considering the Eschatology of 2 Thessalonians ii. 1-12, I must ask to be allowed to assume the authenticity of the Epistle from which it is taken. This may seem a somewhat large assumption in view of the arguments that have recently been directed against its Pauline authorship. But, as I have tried to show elsewhere,¹ interesting though these arguments often are, they are by no means convincing: while the still greater difficulties that surround all conflicting theories of the Epistle's origin are in themselves important evidence in favour of the traditional view. We may accept, then, that view for the present, if only for want of a better. And we may do so the more readily because, as it is the teaching of this very passage which has been generally used as the principal objection to the Epistle's genuineness, we shall have an opportunity of testing the force of that objection when we have seen what it is that the passage really means.

It may seem to some perhaps a more serious matter that in thus postulating the Pauline authorship we at once necessarily exclude all such interpretations of the passage as make it in any way dependent on the teaching of the Apocalypse, or the Nero-redivivus legend, or the Gnostic heresies of the second century. But this again need be the less regretted because there has been a growing tendency to abandon this line of interpretation, even on the part of those scholars who deny the Epistle's authenticity. Wrede, for example, admits that any reference of the passage to Nero has been made wholly impossible by the researches of Bornemann, Jülicher and Zahn, and, from another point of view, of Gunkel and Bousset²; while the assertion that

¹ *The EXPOSITOR* for June, 1904.

² "Die Deutung der Stelle auf Nero ist jedenfalls gründlich erschüttert."

the chapter is in any way influenced by the Johannine Apocalypse no longer finds the support that once it did. And if we can show, as I hope to be able to do, that the passage can be understood in connexion with the conditions of S. Paul's own time, and the general characteristics of his mode of thought, it will be generally admitted that there is no need to go further afield in search of a writer.

For this let me only add by way of preface, that it is solely with the *historical* interpretation of the passage—what it meant for the writer, and for those to whom it was first addressed—that we are at present concerned. It is impossible to attempt even a résumé of the different interpretations that have been applied to it throughout the course of the Church's history: and it lies equally beyond our scope to determine what place, if any, the teaching here embodied is to have in our dogmatic systems regarding the Last Things.

In turning, then, to the passage as an integral part of S. Paul's Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, it may be well, before proceeding to examine it in detail, to recall the circumstances under which that Epistle was written, so far as we can now ascertain them.

On his arrival at Athens, shortly after his expulsion from Thessalonica and brief ministry at Berea, S. Paul, it will be remembered, had despatched Timothy to Thessalonica to "establish" his converts amidst the afflictions from which he had heard that they were suffering, and to "comfort" them concerning their faith (1 Thess. iii. 2). The report which Timothy brought back from Thessalonica, either by word of mouth or in the form of a letter, was in the main highly satisfactory, to judge from the expressions of warm praise which S. Paul bestowed upon the Church

Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs, p. 1. For the relation of the Neronie myth to Antichrist see especially Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah*, p. li. ff

as a whole in the opening verses of his First Epistle to them—an Epistle which was evidently written immediately after Timothy's return (*ἄρτι δὲ ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου*, 1 Thess. iii. 6). One matter only gave the Apostle grave concern, and that was to hear of the aspersions and slanders that had been cast upon the character of his own and his companions' ministry at Thessalonica, after they themselves had left. He nowhere definitely tells us by whom these attacks had been made, but to judge from the language of 1 Thessalonians ii. 14-16—and the point is not without importance for our future inquiry—there can be little doubt that they were the work of the unbelieving, fanatical Jews who had already secured his expulsion from Thessalonica, and who were now doing their utmost to prejudice his converts against him by throwing discredit upon the purity of his motives. It was a charge which the Apostle had little difficulty in meeting by an appeal to the actual experience of the Thessalonian Church. And no sooner had he disposed of it than he turned aside from this, the immediate cause of his writing, to deal with one or two questions of a more practical nature that had been suggested by Timothy's report.

One of these concerned the moral danger which the Thessalonian Christians, who were evidently for the most part Gentiles by birth, ran from contact with the too often vicious and depraved state of the pagan society around them. Another sprang from certain doctrinal difficulties in connexion with the Parousia of the Lord Jesus. We are not concerned with these last at present further than to notice that they were evidently due to the stress which S. Paul had laid on the near approach of Christ's Parousia in accordance with his own personal belief and expectation at the time. And accordingly, no sooner had he reassured the Thessalonians on the special point that was causing them trouble than he proceeded to

inculcate anew the need of constant watchfulness and preparedness in view of a fact so certain in its occurrence, but so uncertain in its precise time and season. "As a thief in the night," so he pointedly warned them, "there is a coming of a day of the Lord" (1 Thess. v. 2).

This teaching, however, had at least one unexpected result. Instead of allaying, it seems rather to have increased the restless excitement of which there had already been signs amongst the Thessalonians (see 1 Thess. v. 12-22), and to have led even in certain cases to an abandonment of their daily tasks—"a business which was no business," "a minding of everybody's business but their own."¹ And accordingly in his Second Epistle, written very shortly after the First, S. Paul set himself to rebuke and correct this state of things. And he did so all the more emphatically because he had heard that the Thessalonians were being encouraged in their idle and fanatical conduct by certain misleading and false influences, which he describes as "by spirit, or by word, or by epistle as from us, as that the day of the Lord is now present" (2 Thess. ii. 2). The verse is one of the most difficult in the Epistle; but whatever the exact interpretation we may attach to its different clauses, they evidently point to certain misleading utterances, and even to carefully planned words and a letter, one or all of them shielding themselves under the Apostle's name and authority, and all calculated to throw the Thessalonians off their balance by insinuating that the Day of the Lord was not only imminent, but was actually come.²

¹ 2 Thess. iii. 7-12. It is true that nowhere in the Epistle does the Apostle directly connect the two things—the near approach of the Parousia and this restless idleness; but, as Hollmann has recently pointed out, only to some such cause can this "Arbeitsscheu" in a Church like the Thessalonian Church be ascribed. *Die Unechtheit des zweiten Thessalonikerbriefs* in the *Zeitschrift f. d. neutest. Wissenschaft*, 1904. Heft i.

² For this meaning of ἐνέστηκεν, cf. Rom. viii. 38, 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26, Gal. i. 4.

Here, then, was the situation that S. Paul had to face—how, on the one hand, to unmask the error underlying these false representations; and on the other, to do nothing to discourage the Thessalonians' belief in the near approach of their Lord. And it must be at once admitted that the manner in which he proceeds to do so is to us at first sight both strange and bewildering. For, instead of conveying his warning in a clear and definite form, the Apostle prefers to embody it in a mysterious apocalyptic picture, which has not only no parallel in his own writings, but is unlike anything else in the New Testament, unless it be certain passages in the Apocalypse of S. John.¹ Nor is this all, but the difficulties of the passage are still further increased by the grammatical irregularities and frequent ellipses with which it abounds, and even more by the manifest reserve with which the whole subject is treated. In the case of the Thessalonians this might not much matter in view of the oral instruction regarding these very things which, as S. Paul reminds them, he had been in the habit of imparting while he was still with them. But to us, who have not had this advantage, the unexplained words and veiled phrases are of such a nature as to make it very questionable whether, with the resources at our disposal, any full and adequate interpretation of them is any longer possible. At the same time we can at least endeavour to indicate the main lines along which any such interpretation must be sought, and to guard against the manifest errors which so often, in popular estimation at least, have been associated with the passage.

Literally translated, it runs as follows :—

Now we beseech you, brethren, touching (or, as to) the Parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto Him, to the end that ye be not hastily shaken from your reason—driven by feverish expectations from your sober senses (Lightfoot)—nor yet be

¹ See especially Rev. xiii. 5-8, 12-17, xvi. 9-11.

disquieted in mind, either by prophetic (i.e. charismatic) utterance, or by reasoned discourse, or by epistle, as though on our authority, representing that the day of the Lord is now present; let no man beguile you in any wise: for *it will not be* (i.e. the Parousia of the Lord will not take place), except the falling away come first, and the man of lawlessness be revealed, the son of perdition, he that opposeth and exalteth himself exceedingly against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he in the temple of God takes his seat, showing off himself as God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I was in the habit of telling you these things? And now—as regards the present—ye know that which restraineth, to the end that he may be revealed in his own season. For the mystery of lawlessness is already set in operation, only until he that now restraineth be taken out of the way (or, supplying the ellipsis, only *it must work in secret, or be unrevealed*, until he that now restraineth be taken out of the way). And then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay by the breath of His mouth, and bring to nought by the glorious manifestation of His Parousia; *even he*, whose parousia is in conformity with the working (or operative power) of Satan in all power and signs and wonders of falsehood, and in all deceit of unrighteousness for them that are perishing; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God sendeth them a working of error, that they should believe the falsehood: that they all might be judged who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

Looking then at the passage as a whole, and taking the events to which it refers, not so much in the order in which the Apostle refers to them as rather in what he indicates to be the order of their actual fulfilment, we find the following sequence:—

1. The mystery of lawlessness already working, but for the present held in check—kept secret—by some restraining power or person.

2. The removal of this restraining power, resulting in what is described as “the falling away,” evidently a general apostasy, which is accompanied by, or rather finds its consummation in, the revelation of the man of lawlessness.

3. The ruinous effect of this supreme manifestation of evil on those who yield themselves to its power, a mani-

festation which, however, is finally ended by the complete destruction of its author at the Parousia of the Lord Jesus.

1. As regards the first of these points—the present working of the mystery of lawlessness—it is clear that we are not to think here of any direct incarnation of evil in contrast to the incarnate God, “the mystery of godliness” (1 Tim. iii. 16): that comes later in the revelation of the lawless one. In the meantime the emphasis lies rather on “the mystery,” by which, in accordance with the distinctive New Testament usage of the word, can only be understood the present secret working of *ἀνομία* as distinguished from its future manifestation. This *ἀνομία*, then, “is already at work” (*ἥδη ἐνεργεῖται*)—a fact which in itself at once disposes of all those futurist interpretations of the passage which were once in such favour—and is only kept from making itself more widely and openly known by the action of a certain restraining power—*τὸ κατέχον*.

It is more difficult to determine in what this last consists. The writer himself makes no attempt to define it further, conscious that his meaning will be clear to his readers (“ye know”); and as the phrase in itself is quite indefinite, the door has been left open for the most varied interpretations. It would serve no good purpose to attempt to enumerate these here, and it is the less necessary because modern scholarship seems to be inclining with ever-increasing unanimity towards the interpretation favoured by the majority of patristic writers from Tertullian onwards, that we have here a reference to the restraining power of law or of government, especially as these were embodied at the time in the Roman State. It is certain at least that S. Paul had already found a “restraining” power in the Roman officials both at Paphos (Acts xiii. 6 ff.) and at Thessalonica itself (Acts xvii. 6 ff.); and it was doubtless these and similar experiences that afterwards led him in his Epistle

to the Romans to speak of "the powers that be" as "ordained of God," and of "rulers" as "not a terror to the good work, but to the evil" (Rom. xiii. 1, 3). There is, therefore, nothing unlikely, to say the least, in his having the same thought in his mind on the present occasion. While the fact that he does not give more definite expression to it is not only in entire accord with the generally cryptic character of apocalyptic writing, but may also be due to prudential motives.¹

2. Strong and salutary, however, as this restraining power or person—for the power is further thought of as centred in a person or class, ὁ κατέχων, he that restraineth—has proved itself, it is not to continue, but is to be taken out of the way.² And no sooner has this happened than there occurs what the writer emphatically describes as ἡ ἀποστασία, the falling away, the definite article showing that he has some well-defined apostasy in view, and one, moreover, of which his readers also had already heard. Again the Apostle does not stay to define it further; but the form of the word, its use in the LXX.,³ and in the only other passage in which it occurs in the New Testament, make it

¹ "For if he had said that after a little while the Roman Empire would be dissolved, they would now immediately have even overwhelmed him as a pestilent person, and all the faithful, as living and warring to this end."—Chrysostom, *Hom. iv. in II. Thess.*

² The manner in which this was to happen is not specified, but that the idea of the end being at hand when the Roman Empire perished was not unfamiliar to Jewish apocalyptic is proved by such passages as 2 (4) Esdr. v. 1 ff., where it is stated that after the destruction of the fourth (Roman) Empire one "shall reign whom the inhabitants of the earth hope not for," by whom Gunkel understands Antichrist (see in Kautsch, *Pseudepigraphen des A.T.* p. 359), and Apoc. Baruch c. 39, 5-7, where the fall of Rome is represented as preceding the coming of the Messiah. For evidence to the same effect from Rabbinical sources, see Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 365 f.

³ E.g. Jer. xxix. 32 ("rebellion against the Lord"), 1 Macc. ii. 15 ("the apostasy," consisting in sacrifice to idols): cf. Jer. ii. 19, 2 Chron. xxix. 19.

⁴ Acts xxi. 21 ("apostasy from Moses"). For the verb see 1 Tim. iv. 1, Heb. iii. 12 ("apostatizing from the living God").

practically certain that it is a *religious* apostasy that he has in view.¹

In this conclusion we are confirmed when we proceed to notice in what the falling away culminates. This is the revelation of the man of lawlessness who is described as (1) ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας, or simply ὁ ἄνομος, the man whose predominating quality is lawlessness, or of whom lawlessness is the true and peculiar mark; (2) ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, he who has fallen under the power of perdition, rather than he who is the means of leading others to perdition (cf. John xvii. 12, and the instructive parallel in LXX. Isaiah lvii. 4, τέκνα ἀπωλείας, σπέρμα ἄνομον); and (3) ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσαι, ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἔστιν θεός, "he that opposeth," or simply "the opposer," and "he that exalteth himself against all that is called God, or that is an object of worship, so that he in the temple of God takes his seat, showing off himself as God."

Now whatever other suggestions may underlie these several descriptions, it is impossible to doubt that in the main they are drawn from the Old Testament, and more especially from the prophecies of Daniel, which exercised so strong an influence on all subsequent eschatological teaching. Thus when in Daniel xi. 36 it is said of Antiochus Epiphanes: "And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god (καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ μεγαλυνθήσεται ἐπὶ πάντα θεόν), and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods (ἐπὶ

¹ In his interesting *Introduction to the Thessalonian Epistles* Dr. Askwith has recently shown a preference for a political interpretation for ἀποστασία, but I do not feel called upon to discuss his argument, if only because I find myself unable to accept on other grounds the view of the man of lawlessness with which it is associated. Dr. Askwith seems to me, if I may venture to say so, anxious to find a more definite historical situation for the passage than is consonant with the general character of apocalyptic teaching in S. Paul's time.

τὸν θεὸν τῶν θεῶν), and he shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished (μέχρις οὗ συντελεσθῇ ἡ ὀργή),” the connexion with v. 4 of the passage before us is at once apparent; while similar illustrative parallels may be adduced from Daniel vii. 25, “And he shall speak words against the Most High,” and Daniel viii. 23–25, where a king of fierce countenance is described, who shall come forth “when their sins are come to the full” (πληρουμένων τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν: cf. 1 Thess. ii. 16, εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας πάντοτε), and “shall destroy the mighty ones, and the people of the saints,” and “falsehood shall prosper in his hands” (καὶ εὐδοωθήσεται τὸ ψεῦδος ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ). And though it is more difficult to find Old Testament warrant for the last trait ascribed by S. Paul to the lawless one “that he in the temple of God takes his seat, showing off himself as God,” it is being increasingly recognized that its real root is to be found in the Danielic reference to “the abomination of desolation” (τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, xii. 11: cf. viii. 13, ix. 27, xi. 31), that is, the heathen altar erected by Antiochus on the altar of burnt offering, or perhaps rather in the more personal form that that phrase would seem to have reached in Jewish tradition, to judge from our Lord’s use of it, as reported in the oldest source: “When ye see the abomination of desolation standing (ἐστηκότα) where *he* ought not” (Mark xiii. 14).¹

When, however, we proceed to ask *whence* this lawless one is to arise, we are at once met with great differences of opinion. Some commentators indeed, as Bornemann, hold that this is a question to which no answer can be given, and that we must be content to regard this mysterious figure as transcending the bounds of history and of race.²

¹ On the relation of this passage to an expected future Antichrist see arts. ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION and ANTICHRIST (§ 4) in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and MAN OF SIN (§ iv.) in Hastings’ *Dictionary of the Bible*.

² “Uebergeschichtlich und international,” Bornemann, *Die Thessalonicherbriefe*, p. 358.

But the expressions used are too precise, and the horror awakened in the writer's mind by his vision too great, not to lead us to believe that he himself had formed as distinct an idea of the lawless one's origin, as he evidently had of his manner of working.

But if so, it is equally certain that this apostate figure is not to be sought within the Christian Church of the day. The time might come when S. Paul would have to lament that falling away of Christ's people from the faith, which Christ Himself had predicted (Acts xx. 29 f.; Eph. iv. 14; 1 Tim. iv. 1; cf. Matt. xxiv. 11 f., xxiv. 24, Luke xviii. 18); but that time was not yet. And the commendation bestowed upon the Thessalonian Church as a whole throughout the Epistle, and nowhere more emphatically than in the verses immediately following this sad picture, forbids us from thinking of any serious lapsing on its part, or even on the part of some of its members, without this being more clearly specified than is the case here.

It must, then, be either out of heathenism or Judaism that the lawless one is to come, and both views have found strong advocates.

Thus in support of the first view it has been argued that a heathen origin for Antichrist is more in accord with the past history of the application to Antiochus Epiphanes¹; while further support is found in the same direction if we can see here any direct reference to the horror produced on Christian minds by the Emperor-worship of the time,² or more particularly by the attempt of Caligula to set up his own statue in the temple of Jerusalem.³ But though such

¹ Cf. further the references to Pompey the Great in the *Psalms of Solomon* (48-40 B.C.), where he is described as ὁ ἀμαρτωλός (ii. 1), and actually as ὁ ἄνομος (xvii. 13) if we can adopt Ewald's happy conjectural reading.

² For the significance of this for the Early Church see Dr. Westcott's Essay on *The Two Empires in The Epistles of St. John*, especially p. 255 ff.

³ Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. c. 8; Philo *Leg. at Caium*, ii. 559 (ὁ Γάιος ἐαυτὸν ἐξετύφωσεν οὐ λέγων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἰόμενος εἶναι θεός).

contemporary historical events may have affected the Apostle's language, and even modified the particular form in which his thought was cast, it is elsewhere that we must look for the real roots of that thought. As both Gunkel¹ and Bousset² have pointed out, times of political excitement do not as a rule give rise to new eschatological yearnings, whose growth and being are a much slower process. And certainly in no case can we believe that it is out of the Roman Empire itself that the man of lawlessness is to be thought of as arising, if, as we have already seen to be probable, it is that Empire which acts as his restraining power.

On the whole, then, while the heathen attacks on the religion of the one true God may have suggested to the Apostle certain features in his description,³ it seems more in keeping with that description as a whole to look for this fanatical outburst of evil as arising within the bounds of Judaism. Thus it is in one who is himself *ὁ ἄνομος* that it is said to reach its head. And though there is doubtless a sense in which "lawlessness" is a characteristic of the Gentile nations who "know not God,"⁴ it is still more applicable to the Jews who, while having the law, openly set themselves in defiance to it.⁵ The fact too that the lawless one regards the temple at Jerusalem as the dwelling-place of God is further evidence in the same direction. For it will not do to say that the phrase "the temple of God"

¹ *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, p. 221 ff.

² *The Antichrist Legend*, p. 143.

³ See e.g. the Gog and Magog assault of the Gentiles on Jerusalem in Ezek. xxxviii., xxxix.

⁴ It is specially predicated of them in 2 Cor. vi. 14, and for *ἄνομος* used technically of the Gentiles as those without law, see Acts ii. 23, 1 Cor. ix. 21.

⁵ According to Dr. Ginsburg, art. ANTICHRIST in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, the lawless one is none other than Belial (cf. 2 Cor. vi. 10), a name interpreted by the Rabbis as compounded of בלי without, and יוקל yoke, so that Belial is one who will not accept the yoke of the law. See also Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah*, p. lxii.

is to be understood here figuratively of the Christian Church, much as S. Paul himself afterwards used it (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17, 2 Cor. vi. 16; and see Eph. ii. 21). The twice-repeated article—*εἰς τὸν καθόν τοῦ θεοῦ*—and especially the mention of the lawless one's *taking his seat*, an expression that can hardly be understood metaphorically, conclusively show that the temple at Jerusalem can alone be meant, a temple that was actually standing when the Apostle wrote.

Nor were there wanting circumstances in S. Paul's surroundings at the time which might well lead him to look for such a climax of wickedness amongst his fellow-countrymen. Up to this time, as Dr. Bernard Weiss has well pointed out, the Apostle had not met with any fundamental opposition from the Gentiles. "The evil and unreasonable people, who everywhere stood in his way (*ἄτοποι καὶ πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι*) to be delivered from whom was, in his opinion, the condition of an unhindered activity of the word of God (2 Thess. iii. 1, 2), and by whom Satan had already often hindered him (1 Thess. ii. 18), were the fanatical Jews. They had for the most part remained disobedient to the Gospel (2 Thess. i. 8), they had persecuted him from the commencement of his missionary activity (Acts ix. 23, 24, 29, xiii. 8, 45), they had everywhere stirred up the heathen populace against him (xiii. 50, xiv. 2, 5, 19, xvii. 5, 13), and had shown themselves his deadly enemies (xviii. 6; cf. 1 Thess. iii. 7). It was against their evil calumnies and slanders that he had to defend himself, in the First Epistle, before the young Christian Church, which they sought, by these means, to turn away from their teacher."¹

What more natural, then, than that the Apostle should continue to look to these Jews as the real source and cause of the time of tribulation and travail which, in accordance with the prevailing belief of his time, was to precede the

¹ *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, Eng. Tr. vol. i. p. 306.

appearance of the Messiah? ¹ And as Christ Himself had warned against false prophets who would tempt men to believe in false Messiahs (Matt. vii. 15, xxiv. 4 f.; Mark xiii. 21 f.; Luke xvii. 21, 23; cf. Acts xiii. 6 ff.), it was but a following out of the same train of thought that S. Paul should depict the opposition to Christ as finally reaching its head in a pseudo- or counterfeit Messiah, who has his "mystery," his "revelation," and his "parousia" just like the true, and who stands in the same relation to Satan that Christ stands to God.²

3. This comes out, if possible, still more clearly in the description of Antichrist's working or *ἐνεργεία*, a word which elsewhere S. Paul uses expressly of the exercise of Divine power (Eph. i. 19, iii. 7; Phil. iii. 21; Col. i. 29, ii. 12), and which here shows itself "in all power and signs and wonders" (*ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν*)—the same three terms by which in various combinations the miracles of Christ and His disciples are elsewhere described (Acts ii. 22; Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Heb. ii. 14)—only with this fatal difference, that in the present instance they are all works "of falsehood" (*ψεύδους*). False in themselves, they lead also to falsehood, with the result that those who submit themselves to their power are miserably deceived "in return for their refusal to entertain the love of the truth" (*ἀνθ' ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέξαντο*)—a refusal which, though in the first instance due to their own wilful conduct, the Apostle does not hesitate to refer in the last instance to God Himself in true Old Testament

¹ Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, p. 173 ff.

² With this caricature of Christ may be compared the account of Beliar in *The Ascension of Isaiah*, c. iv. 6-8, a passage which Dr. Charles regards as of Christian origin inserted in an older Jewish work: "And all that he hath desired he will do in the world: he will do and speak like the Beloved and he will say: 'I am God, and before me there has been none.' And all the people in the world will believe in him. And they will sacrifice to him and they will serve him saying: 'This is God and beside him there is no other.'"

fashion. As they loved lies, God "sends" them lies for their portion.

And yet, after all, in accordance with a fundamental law of Jewish apocalyptic, this climax of evil only proves the herald of its final destruction. For "the Lord Jesus shall slay [the lawless one] with the breath of His mouth, and bring [him] to nought by the glorious manifestation of His Parousia."

The first part of this description is clearly drawn from the prophecy of the destruction of the Rod of Jesse in Isaiah xi. 4 (*καὶ ἐν πνεύματι διὰ χειλέων ἀνελεῖ ἀσεβῆν*), a passage which the Targum of Jonathan afterwards applied to the destruction of Armillus, the Jewish Antichrist, and whose use here, therefore, S. Paul may well have drawn from the Jewish tradition of his time; while with the latter part may be compared the LXX. version of Isaiah xxvi. 10, "Let the wicked be taken away, that he may not see the glory of the Lord" (*ἀρθήτω ὁ ἀσεβής, ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου*), and still more suggestively the vision of the Son of man foreshadowed by Daniel (vii. 13, 14 LXX.), and to which our Lord Himself points as the signal of the final consummation (Mark xiii. 26, with Dr. Swete's note).

Such, then, is the passage; and if we have understood it rightly, this at least is certain, that it is to be taken neither as a direct and original revelation granted to S. Paul, nor as an arbitrary invention on his part, but rather as a recasting in the light of his personal experience, and of the particular circumstances in which he found himself at the time, of certain beliefs long held amongst the Jewish people.¹

Thus we have had frequent occasion to notice how powerfully the language and ideas of the Book of Daniel

¹ "Die *ἀνθρωπος*-Erwartung des 2 Thessalonicherbriefes ist also nicht willkürliche Erfindung eines Einzelnen, sondern nur der Ausdruck eines in langer Geschichte gewordenen und damals allgemein verbreiteten Glaubens." Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, p. 221.

have influenced the whole passage, and other parallels from the Old Testament might easily be cited. Bornemann, for example, has traced many echoes from the LXX. version of Pss. xciii. and lxxxviii. in the *ἄνομος* section, and other illustrations of its various details from Old Testament prophecy will be found in the different Commentaries. Apart, moreover, from these incidental comparisons, it is of interest to notice that the central idea of the whole conception is in entire accord with that predominant element in the teaching of the prophets which led them whenever they saw "a quickening of the currents of providence in any direction, whether of judgment or salvation" to see in it "the beginning of the day of the Lord."

Nor in estimating further the formative influences in S. Paul's conceptions regarding the Last Things, can we lose sight of the effect produced upon his mind by the eschatological teaching of Jesus, as that has been handed down in the Apostolic tradition. Of this dependence we have abundant proof in the Parousia passages of 1 Thessalonians, as e.g. in the comparison of the day of the Lord with a thief in the night (1 Thess. v. 2; Matt. xxiv. 43), and the consequent exhortation not to sleep, but to watch and be sober (1 Thess. v. 6 f.; Matt. xxiv. 42). And the same dependence appears still more strikingly in the chapter before us. Dr. Kennedy, indeed, in his recent valuable lectures on the Pauline Eschatology, does not hesitate to say that Matthew xxiv. is the most instructive commentary upon it, citing as parallels 2 Thessalonians ii. 1 with Matthew xxiv. 31; ii. 2 with xxiv. 6; ii. 3 with xxiv. 12, 4; ii. 4 with xxiv. 15; ii. 9 with xxiv. 24.² And it should also be noted that according to John v. 43 our Lord

¹ Dr. A. B. Davidson, *The Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 379.

² *S. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, pp. 55, 56.

distinctly contemplated a leader "coming in his own name" and demanding allegiance.

When, however, we pass beyond these two influences, the influence of the Old Testament and of the teaching of Jesus, it is more difficult to determine what is the precise nature of the Apostle's relation here to contemporary Jewish thought. We cannot, of course, forget that S. Paul was not only a man but a theologian of his time, and that his early Pharisaic training could hardly fail to leave its traces upon his whole doctrinal system. At the same time I venture to think that these traces are to be looked for rather in the framework or outward setting of the Apostle's teaching than in its actual contents. And certainly, so far as the passage before us is concerned, I have been unable to discover any essential feature in it which would seem to have been taken over from current Judaistic notions, without first being authenticated in the literature of the Old Testament or the Synoptic tradition.

The same may be said regarding the very interesting attempt of Bousset in his *Antichrist Legend* to find evidence here of a primitive eschatological tradition which had been handed down orally in Judaism, and which, in the form which it assumes in the Pauline teaching, is nothing else than a later anthropomorphic transformation of the Babylonian myth of the dragon which stormed the abode of God (see especially pp. 128 ff., 144, 165 f., 182).

I am, of course, very far from denying the possibility of some connexion between this old myth and the Pauline man of lawlessness, more particularly in view of the light that has recently been thrown, not only on the Old Testament but on the New Testament, from Babylonian and other Eastern sources. And yet one cannot but desire clearer evidence for the existence of the tradition in its Jewish form than any Bousset has been able to furnish. He depends mainly, as is well known, on certain data con-

cerning Antichrist which he finds in the eschatological commentaries of Irenæus, Hippolytus, and other early Fathers, and which, because unsupported by anything in the Bible, can only (he thinks) be referred to some such esoteric doctrine that had not previously been embodied in any written records. But is it not just as likely that these foreign data were rather the result of the imaginations of the spiritualizing commentators themselves, working upon what they found both here and in the other passages relating to Antichrist in the Scriptures? ¹ And in any case, if this Jewish tradition really existed in the form which Bousset's theory requires, is it conceivable that it should have left no traces of itself in early Rabbinical literature? ²

On the main point, then—the fundamental sources from which the picture before us has been drawn—we do well to depend chiefly upon the LXX. version of the Old Testament, and the eschatological teaching of Jesus, or perhaps one should rather say that teaching as interpreted in the light of the writer's living Christian experience, leaving to Judaistic tradition and primitive myth little more than the possible suggestion of certain features in the outward portraiture. ³

Even, however, if it be granted that these several influences are sufficient to have supplied the materials from which a Jewish writer of S. Paul's time might have constructed the picture we have been considering, it may still be objected that in no case can that writer have been

¹ Kennedy, *ut supr.* p. 212 f.

² Mr. Thackeray thinks that the lack of early Rabbinical attestation for the belief is probably due to its being adopted by the Christians, and to the important part which it played in their expectation of the second coming of Christ (*The Relation of S. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, p. 137).

³ On the subsequent doctrinal and historical value of the passage see the brief but suggestive summary by Dr. Lock in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iv. p. 749, § vi.

S. Paul himself, as has hitherto been assumed; for, if our interpretation of the passage is correct, it is inconsistent (1) with the eschatology of 1 Thessalonians—whose Pauline authorship is beyond question, and (2) with the light in which the Apostle elsewhere represents the future of his fellow-countrymen.

(1) As regards the first of these points, it must be kept in view that any supposed inconsistency with 1 Thessalonians is not to be looked for, as is often done, in a lengthened delay of the Parousia in the teaching of the Second Epistle. For there, just as much as in the First Epistle, the Parousia is regarded as close at hand, the signs preceding it being already at work (v. 7). It is rather in the introduction of any such "signs" at all, and in the consequent depriving the Parousia of its unexpected character that S. Paul seems to come into conflict here with his own earlier teaching.

At most the conflict is not a very serious one, and justification for the Apostle's attitude has been sought in the presence of the same apparent inconsistency in the record of our Lord's own eschatological discourses, and also in the general apocalyptic literature of the time.¹ But after all, it is probably wiser not to attempt to reconcile the two positions too literally. Nothing can be clearer than that S. Paul had at this time no definite and ordered system regarding the Last Things, and that his teaching on any particular occasion was determined by practical rather than by theological motives.² It was only natural, then, that on hearing of the special restlessness which, as we have seen, the Thessalonians were manifesting at this time, he should

¹ See Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristenthums*, i. p. 129 f.

² "Es sind also nur Bruchstücke seiner Anschauung gegeben, und zwar solche, die unter den gegebenen Umständen zu betonen nötig war,"—Bornemann, *ut sup.* p. 535.

be led to emphasize anew (2 Thess. ii. 5) that aspect of the Parousia by which he thought this restlessness could be most successfully checked; and all the more so, if that aspect fell in with a passing mood in his own mind caused by the circumstances in which he found himself.

(2) For, to pass to the second point, there is nothing psychologically impossible in the attitude which S. Paul here adopts towards the Jews, as compared, for example, with the view that he takes of their future in Romans xi. We have seen how hardly beset and thwarted he was by the Jews at the time that the Epistle was written. And terrible no doubt as is the picture of the false Jewish Messiah, which, according to our interpretation, he here paints, there is after all nothing in it more condemnatory of his nation than the scathing words of 1 Thessalonians ii. 14-16, of which we can only get rid by an altogether unsupported theory of interpolation.¹ For the time being the Apostle could see in his unregenerate fellow-countrymen only the active and determined opponents of all that was dearest to him, and essential for their own salvation. And it needed the course of subsequent events to open his eyes to the wider possibilities that God had in store for His chosen people.

On the whole, then, there seems to be nothing in the teaching of this passage, as we have tried to understand it, to prevent our continuing to regard it as genuinely Pauline. And if so, it must clearly be taken into account in any attempt to frame a complete picture of the Apostle's views regarding the Last Things.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

¹ Schmiedel, *Hand-Commentar zum N.T.* in loco.

THE EARLIEST NEW TESTAMENT.

WE have been assisted in the restoration of Codex Bezae (EXPOSITOR, July, pp. 46-53) by the consideration that those of the Fathers who used a "Western" text of the New Testament did not know all the Catholic Epistles, at least so far as we can tell.

The only Greek manuscript which contains a text wholly Western in foundation (however much spoiled by correctors), is necessarily typical. Its ascertained contents may now be compared with the New Testament books known to the Fathers who used a "Western" text. A few of these Fathers have bequeathed to us such abundant writings that we can tell with some certainty what books they knew or did not know. The following list tabulates this comparison. I have added the "Cheltenham catalogue," called in Germany the "Mommсен'sche Verzeichniss." As one of the codices which contains it is at St. Gall, while the other is no longer at Cheltenham, I prefer to call it "Mommсен's list." I do not include the Muratorian canon, as it is defective and eclectic.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Cod. Bezae	Canon Mommсs.	Iren- aeus	Clem. Al.	Tertul- lian	Cyprian (Papias)	
Mt.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mc.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lc.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jo.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Acts	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	?
xiii Paul	[Cod. Clar.]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	?
Hebr.			[Yes]	[Yes]			
James							
1 Pet.	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2 Pet.		?					
1 Jo.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2 Jo.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	
3 Jo.	Yes	Yes					?
Jude				Yes	Yes		
Apoc.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Col. 1. It is not impossible that Codex Bezae may have originally contained 1 Peter after Acts. I have supplied the thirteen epistles of St. Paul from the kindred Codex Claromontanus (D^{Paul}), in which Hebrews is obviously an afterthought.

Col. 2. This list apparently dates from 359, and it is therefore the table of contents of some Bible earlier than the Vulgate. It was evidently published at Rome.

Col. 3. Eusebius tells us (*H.E.* v. 26) that St. Irenaeus quoted Hebrews in a book of various discourses. A quotation occurs in the (spurious) second Pfafrican fragment. Photius says that Irenaeus denied the Pauline authorship of the Epistle. There is no certain quotation of it in the five books against heresies (the most probable is *verbo virtutis suae*, ii. 30, 9). Harvey has enumerated only eleven possible references to it. On the other hand the allusions to or quotations from Romans and 1 Corinthians are given by the same editor as 87 and 104 respectively.

Col. 4. Clement was a learned man, who seems to have used other codices besides his habitual Western Bible. But in the *Hypotyposes* he did not comment on James, 2 Peter, and 3 John, and he never quotes these books. He knew Hebrews, of course; but he did not attribute it to St. Paul, except in a presumed Hebrew original. This suggests that it was a separate work from the thirteen Pauline Epistles, as he knew it. The fact that he knew Jude need not surprise us, in view of the number even of Apocrypha to which he attributed some authority.

Col. 5. Tertullian appears to quote Hebrews only on a single occasion, and he then attributes it to Barnabas. He quotes Jude by name. But it is not certain that he knew only a "Western" Bible. He may have used more than one Greek text. Whether he had already a Latin translation of Jude or no, we cannot tell. But this epistle was probably earlier rendered than James and 2 Peter.

Col. 6. St. Cyprian seems not to know Jude. It may be merely accident that Tertullian, Cyprian, and Irenaeus never quote 3 John, but it may be a point of contact with Clement (who certainly did not use that epistle), and with the Muratorian canon.

Col. 7. I have added Papias to this list. I cannot here give my reasons for supposing that he knew Acts and the Epistles of St. Paul. It is admitted by Harnack and others that he knew our four Gospels, and I hope to make this clear in the *Revue Bénédictine* for July, 1905. He quoted 1 John and 1 Peter, and had evidently much to say about the Apocalypse. If he had quoted from Hebrews, James, Jude, 2 Peter, or had mentioned them by name, Eusebius would probably have noticed the fact, although he perhaps read Papias rather carelessly. It has been thought that he has a reference to 3 John 12: "ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας," where he speaks of precepts ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγομένας τῆς ἀληθείας (ap. Euseb. *H.E.* iii. 39).

1. The table appears to establish that the Western authorities agree in the use of certain books, and in the omission of others. It seems that Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, and Jude did not belong to this set of books. 3 John is doubtful.

2. But we do not merely conclude that these books chanced to be known individually to a certain circle of writers, for we find that an exact catalogue of them is given by Mommsen's list, that Codex Bezae (+ Codex Claromontanus) contains the same collection. It follows that we have to do with a *definite New Testament*, an authorized collection of canonical books, written in a single codex (or pair of codices) or in rolls contained in a single *capsa*.

3. The unity of this collection is remarkably testified by the type of the text, some of the same marked characteristics which we know as "Western" reappearing more or less in all the books. These have therefore a common history, and have been emendated, interpolated, harmonized, by the same series of hands.

4. This "Western" New Testament was known to Irenaeus and to Clement of Alexandria. It was used later by Hippolytus, sometimes by Origen, and regularly by Eusebius. It is the foundation of the Gospels in the Curetonian Syriac and in the Diatessaron of Tatian, and is at least connected with those of the Sinaitic Syriac. The whole collection was apparently turned into Latin before Tertullian. In the time of Novatian and Cyprian we find already two distinct types of renderings, the so-called African and European.

5. The date of the collection is therefore to be placed before Irenaeus c. 180. In notes to Dean Armitage Robinson's *Acts of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas* we find some reasons for placing the Latin translation earlier than the letter of the Martyrs of Lyons, A.D. 177. Probably the collection was known to Justin, c. 150,¹ possibly to Papias (c. 140-5 at the very latest).

¹ St. Justin Martyr has many distinctively Western readings. Besides the four Gospels, Acts and many Epistles of St. Paul, we find that he certainly knows Hebrews and probably James. Now it is pretty certain that Clement of Rome knew these two books. Hermas also knew James; therefore Justin may have got to know these two Epistles at Rome

6. As to the origin of the collection, I can say little here, except that the evidence (so far as we have traced it above) points to Asia, or thereabouts, as the home of the "Western" New Testament.

a. Papias is an Asiatic. We know that Justin was converted at Ephesus, and he seems to have combined the Western collection with books used at Rome, where he afterwards resided and died. Irenaeus passed his youth at Smyrna. Clement had an Asiatic teacher. The Latin translation, wherever it was made, may quite well have used a text derived from Asia. At the end of the second century the Western text was largely diffused. This was not owing to Roman influence, so far as we can tell, for there is no evidence before Hippolytus that the text was even known at Rome. We naturally presume Asiatic influence, for the Asiatic churches were immensely populous and prosperous.

β. In the third century the Western text seems to have lost its vogue, and with Origen the neutral begins to dominate. I cannot here explain the many reasons which have gradually led me to hold that the neutral readings in the African Latin are not original, but corrections made at the beginning of the third century, when "Western" peculiarities were beginning to be looked upon askance. I regard the European text as retaining earlier readings, though the African has the earlier renderings.¹ In the same way I

for they were probably not known in Asia. As he knew the Apocalypse, he will probably have known 1, 2 John. As 1 Peter was known both at Rome (Clement, Hermas) and in Asia (Polycarp, Papias), he can hardly have been ignorant of it. It is therefore probable that he knew the whole Western collection, together with Hebrews and James. Hippolytus also used the Western collection, and perhaps other books also.

¹ The question whether we are to look upon the European and African texts as two translations seems to me a question of words. They cannot be wholly independent in origin. But "a greatly revised edition," or "a new translation under the influence of the earlier one" are indistinguishable, so far as I can see.

suppose the Curetonian Syriac to have received some neutral emendations, while the Sinaitic may be a very completely neutralized Western text, or a Westernized neutral text,—in any case less primitive in form than the Curetonian, although its readings are much older and better. I do not dogmatize on this subject; I merely mention what has for some time seemed to me the most convenient working hypothesis. However this may be, there seem to be some symptoms of the wane of the importance of the “Western text” from the beginning of the third century. This remarkably coincides with the wane of the importance of the Asiatic Churches, principally owing to the prevalence of Montanism among them, and (possibly in some part) to the Paschal controversy.¹

γ. But the internal evidence of the collection is not to be passed over. We find in it the Tetrevangelium, a collection which was very probably made in Asia. We find a Pauline collection, which naturally connects itself with the Pauline Churches of Asia:—Acts, Epistles of Paul, joined to the Gospel of St. Luke. Then there is an *instrumentum Joannis*,—the Apocalypse and 3 (2?) Epistles. These are Asiatic. One book remains, 1 Peter. This was addressed to Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, ASIA, and Bithynia. The omitted books,—Hebrews, James, Jude, 2 Peter, are just those books which have no apparent connexion with Asia at all.

δ. The internal evidence of the books has also to be con-

¹ It was precisely at this time that the earlier canon of the Old Testament came to be questioned. The earliest Christian writers, beginning with Clement of Rome, habitually quoted the deuterocanonical writings of the Old Testament as Scripture (Swete, *Introd. to O.T. in Gk.*, p. 224). These books seem to have been translated into Latin together with the “Western” New Testament. But at the end of the second century doubts begin to appear. Melito of Sardis made enquiry in Palestine, and arrived at the Hebrew canon, about 180 A.D.; later on, Origen arrived at a similar result, and the subsequent Greek Fathers followed suit. So that the earlier O.T. canon appears to have gone out of fashion in the East just about the period in which the earlier N.T. canon was being doubted and its text superseded.

sidered. The most important point is that the famous Western interpolations in Acts were made by some one who knew Asia. It is probable that both the *pericope de adultera* and the last twelve verses of St. Mark belonged to the Western text. Both seem to have been known to Papias. If these premises are right, we have found a further connexion with Asia.

These suggestions are all I have to say for the moment about the date and origin of this early Testament. But the existence of such a collection and its wide diffusion in the second half of the second century throws great light on the history of the deutero-canonical writings of the New Testament.

On the one hand we have the Apocalypse. We have no evidence that its authenticity and canonicity were ever doubted until the first years of the third century, when Gaius at Rome rejected it, and evidently ascribed it to Cerinthus. But this book formed a part of our widely circulated Asiatic New Testament. This explains its rejection, and accounts also for the possibility of its reception by the anti-chiliastic party at a time when the Western collection was going out of fashion and the Asiatic Churches were losing some of their prestige, and when Alexandria was taking the first place in theology.

On the other hand, James, Jude, 2 Peter and Hebrews begin to emerge from obscurity just at this very time. At first their reception by the Churches is hesitating. They had been known, perhaps, in a single region, or here and there. I have remarked above that there are traces of James at Rome, and also of Hebrews. But of Jude and 2 Peter there is no certain trace in the second century. Jude first appears in Clement of Alexandria, and as an addition to the Latin translation of the Western New Testament. 2 Peter finds the most difficulty in gaining recognition, as being the latest (it would seem) to be

published to the world from the place of its hiding. At the same time other writings are pleading for recognition, the Pastor, the Apocalypse of Peter, and many others of less weight. The "Western" canon is not after 200 regarded as so authoritative that it may not enlarge its borders.

But we must not hastily assume that this "Western" collection was the only New Testament of the second century, because we know of no other. The second century writers who are preserved to us are connected with Asia, and it is natural that we find few traces of the books which had no connexion with that province. But there were certainly other texts in use, and the "Western" text was eventually so completely smothered by these and by their developments, that its form of the Gospels has survived but in a single Greek manuscript, its Acts in perhaps two, its Apostolus in three or four, while its Apocalypse is utterly lost so far as a continuous Greek text is concerned. We should therefore not be safe in assuming it to be certain that even in the second century the "Western" text was the most widely diffused, though there is considerable probability in this. But it is at least probable that it was the earliest large collection, the earliest which we could practically consider to be a whole New Testament. If not the most diffused text, yet the Bible of the populous Churches of Asia Minor had, perhaps, the greatest number of readers, and it was that of the chief writers of the second century. It belonged to a region in which an Apostle was believed to have lived until the time of Trajan, and where Apostolic memories were longer related at second hand than elsewhere. The collection was certainly—whether Asiatic or not, whether the most widely diffused or not,—the most important second century collection. It may have been not merely the largest, but the only large collection. For the use of the various inspired books may

have been sporadic and accidental, and they may have been only loosely united to one another by the habits of individual Churches. On this point it is not necessary to dwell here. One cannot help wondering where the neutral text came from, and where it was latent in the second century. It must surely have existed in Bible form in the third. Had this collection been made up from different groups or different units? If so, how comes it that the text is so uniform in certain characteristics, so singularly pure, and so uncontaminated by the Western peculiarities?

The determination of the contents of the Western New Testament elucidates another difficult point; I mean the list given by Eusebius. In *H.E.* iii. 25 he enumerates the New Testament writings. First come the Gospels, then the Acts, then the Epistles of Paul, and one of John and one of Peter. To these the Apocalypse is to be added, "if this is thought good": καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις, "these are counted as acknowledged." It seems a contradiction thus to call the Apocalypse an "acknowledged" book, and yet to permit its rejection! Eusebius continues:—The ἀντιλεγόμενα or disputed books, but known to most, are James, Jude, 2 Peter and 2 John. A third class contains the νόθα or spurious books, to which are assigned the Acts of Paul, the Pastor, the Apocalypse of Peter, Barnabas, the Didache, and "as I said" the Apocalypse, in the opinion of some.

Now the acknowledged books are simply the "Western" New Testament, minus 2 and 3 John (both of which may have been sometimes omitted as private letters).¹ It has been already remarked that Eusebius almost always used a distinctively "Western" text. We now see why he

¹ But it is also possible that only 3 John was wanting in Eusebius's Western Bible, and that he added 2 John to it as an ἀντιλεγόμενον, because it was obvious that both were by the same author, and because he wished to attribute both to John the Presbyter.

included the Apocalypse among the *ὁμολογούμενα*,—it formed part of this venerable collection. The *ἀντιλεγόμενα* or deutero-canonical books, are the books which in Eusebius's day were received by most, but did not form part of the "Western" text.¹ Consequently the Apocalypse belongs by right to the *ὁμολογούμενα*, but if rejected (on account of the support it gives to chiliastic views, and in accordance with the arguments of Dionysius the Great) it tumbles into the third class of *νόθα*. It could not be reckoned, in any case, in the second class.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

¹ Only one difficulty is to be noticed. The Epistle to the Hebrews is passed over, unless we suppose that Eusebius includes it among those of St. Paul. But it seems rather from carelessness that it is not here mentioned as doubtful, since Eusebius had pointed to the fact in iii. 3 and records elsewhere the opinions of Clement, Gaius and Origen about it (vi. 14, 20, 25).

*THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST.
MARK.*¹

XXXVI. THE THIRD DAY IN JERUSALEM, XI. 20—
XIII. 21.

AT this point St. Mark abandons the attempt to give each day's events separately and tells us² that Jesus left the city every evening. The Evangelist records sayings and incidents belonging to the period just before the Passion without assigning to each a definite date; but the narrative gives the impression that what is dealt with in this section happened on the same day.

(a) *The Fig Tree Withered*; xi. 20, 21. Another night was spent outside the city, probably at Bethany; a night during which Jesus leaned on Divine strength in His patient waiting for the inevitable end; a night of anxious perplexity for the disciples. In the morning they turned their steps once more towards Jerusalem; and on their way they came to the fig tree which Jesus had cursed. It stood there withered, blasted as it seemed by some supernatural power. Peter called the attention of his Master and reminded Him that He had cursed the tree, and, behold, now it was withered. Jesus made no answer³; to Him the episode was a casual incident, out of the line of

¹ These studies do not profess to be an adequate historical and doctrinal account of Christ, but are an attempt to set forth the impression which St. Mark's account of our Lord would make on a reader whose only source of information was the Second Gospel, and who knew nothing of Christian dogmatics.

² Chap. xi. 19, R.V.

³ In the Gospel as it stands Jesus replies with an exhortation to faith and forgiveness, verses 22-25. But this paragraph is quite irrelevant to its context, and gives the impression that its contents are sayings of our Lord which the Evangelist found without historical setting, and inserted conjecturally at this point. Either, therefore, the actual answer of Jesus was not preserved, or He did not reply. R.V. omits verse 26.

His special work ; but to the disciples the blasted tree was a happy omen, a foreshadowing of the ruin of their Master's enemies. They forgot that He did not curse His enemies.

(b) *The Authority of Jesus ; xi. 27-33.* They went on again to Jerusalem and the Temple, where Jesus still maintained the new order and prevented the fair from being held. The officials would desire to rescue the sanctuary from "this Galilean fanatic" at the earliest possible moment but without further disturbance to public order.

First they tried moral suasion ; an imposing deputation, chief priests, scribes and elders, confronted Jesus in the sacred courts and challenged His claim to interfere with the administration of the Temple.

"By what authority do you act thus ? Or who gave you authority to act thus ?"

It was an embarrassing question. The disciples would expect Him to answer that He acted in His own right, or by Divine commission, as the Messiah. Any other reply would have been a denial of His Messiahship ; and yet if He publicly and emphatically proclaimed Himself Messiah in the hearing of a crowd of enthusiastic followers, the city would be in an uproar ; it might soon be involved in the horrors of a popular insurrection. Thus the spiritual ideals for which Jesus stood, and His own personal character, would be lost sight of in the confusion. He had, indeed, allowed the multitude at Bethany to acclaim Him as the "Son of David" ; but the incident made no impression on Jerusalem. By this time, however, Jesus had obtained a hold on the populace, and His claim could not be repeated and pushed without causing dangerous excitement.

Jesus, therefore, met the demand of the deputation by a question, and thus suggested an answer, which He would not give point blank.

"I, in My turn, will ask you one thing. Answer Me,
VOL. XII.

and I will tell you by what authority I act thus. John's baptism, was it from heaven or from men? Answer Me!"

John the Baptist had borne testimony to Jesus, and if his prophetic calling and Divine mission had been admitted, it would have followed at the very least that Jesus was a prophet and had authority to reform public abuses. It may, however, be doubted whether at this juncture the officials would think of the Baptist's testimony to Jesus, though probably it was known to some of the deputation. Jesus' question had placed them in a dilemma which prevented them considering what bearing it might have on their own demand as to His authority. The dilemma was so obvious that St. Mark does not hesitate to describe the feelings of those whom Jesus addressed, although he can scarcely have been in the confidence of the priestly officials. "They reasoned with themselves," he tells us, "saying, If we say from heaven, He will say, Why did you not believe Him? But if we say, from men——." The latter alternative was impossible as an answer, at any rate, in face of the crowd by whom they were hemmed in—"They feared the people, for all firmly believed that John was a prophet." Possibly the priests and their colleagues drew apart, and discussed the matter amongst themselves in some such terms as these; possibly they were merely conscious that these obvious thoughts were in each other's minds.

After a brief pause they answered Jesus, "We do not know."

Jesus was thus prevented from appealing to the authority of John the Baptist, but the failure of the priests to deal with the dilemma in which He had involved them made it possible for Him to refuse to answer their question.

"Neither do I tell you," said He, "by what authority I act thus."

And under the circumstances they could not very well press the matter.

(c) *The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen*; *iii.* 1-12. And yet He answered them after all : in His characteristic fashion He began telling a story.—A man let a vineyard on condition that he should receive a share of the vintage by way of rent ; but when he sent again and again for what was due to him it was persistently withheld, and his messengers were illtreated, and some of them murdered. At last he sent his only son, thinking that his recalcitrant tenants would not venture to resist his son. But they said one to another, “ This is the heir ; come, let us kill him, and then we may have undisputed possession of the vineyard.” And they seized him, and killed him, and threw him out of the vineyard.

He finished the story by declaring that the owner of the vineyard would put his wicked tenants to death, and give the vineyard to others.

Then He added a quotation from the Psalms :—

“ The stone which the builders rejected,
The same was made the chief corner stone ;
This was the Lord’s doing,
And it is marvellous in our eyes.”

The story is based on a free adaptation of a passage in Isaiah,¹ and its moral would be clear to the deputation, to the disciples, and probably to most of those within hearing. The vineyard was the people of God, Israel, or, as we should say, the Church ; the owner, God ; the wicked tenants, the rulers of Israel, in the present instance, the priests, scribes, and elders, whose representatives stood before Him ; the messengers were the prophets ; the only son was Jesus.

So far all was clear ; the story, in Jesus’ unobtrusive fashion, asserted His claim to unique authority, to Messiahship ; He had answered their question and told them that

¹ Isaiah v 1-7.

He controlled the Temple as Son of God. But the sequel was unexpected; His audience would expect the tale to end with the triumph of the owner's son over the wicked tenants, but it ended with his death. Thus again we are taken into the confidence of Jesus; He found Himself the object of popular enthusiasm; He had successfully asserted His authority; none the less, He knew that He was doomed.

The parable angered the priests, and at the same time the announcement of His death seemed like an offer to surrender Himself into their hands; they made a movement to seize Him, but His followers interposed and baffled the attempt, and the official deputation withdrew.

(d) *The Tribute Money* : *xii. 13-17*. The Jewish officials next sought to deal with Jesus indirectly. Some time ago in Galilee the Herodians, the partisans of Herod and the Romans, had allied themselves with the Pharisees, the popular religious leaders, against Jesus. Now the priests succeeded in forming a similar combination in Jerusalem, and sent representatives of the two parties to beguile Jesus into compromising Himself. The allies entered the Temple courts, made their way to Jesus, and presented themselves in the character of anxious inquirers after truth with tokens of the utmost deference.

"Teacher," said they, "we know that you are frank and entirely indifferent to personal considerations, and that you teach the way of God without reserve or compromise. Is it right to pay tribute to Cæsar or not? Ought we to pay, or ought we not to pay?"

Probably they did not expect to deceive Jesus, but they observed the usual forms of polite address in order that they might not irritate His followers. It was another obvious dilemma, and on whichever horn Jesus impaled

¹ Mark iii. 6; cf. viii. 15.

Himself, one or other of the two sets of inquirers was ready to take immediate advantage of His predicament. If He enjoined payment, the Pharisees would detach the people from Him by declaring that He was no patriot, but a friend of the Romans and an enemy of the cause of Israel. If He forbade payment, the Herodians would denounce Him to the Romans, who would promptly arrest Him and put Him to death.

But for Jesus the question raised a somewhat different problem, with which He had been confronted throughout His ministry. If He endorsed the claims of the Roman government, He destroyed the faith of the people in Himself and His mission; but if He repudiated those claims, He made Himself the leader of a political revolt, in which His spiritual character and work would be lost sight of—a revolt which would discredit His message by its inevitable failure. Jesus must have thought much on this urgent problem; He must have become familiar with it in all its bearings, and have solved it for Himself as far as its more general aspects were concerned; indeed, He had probably considered the special difficulty with which He now had to deal.

Naturally He at once discerned the hostile purpose, which was only thinly veiled by the profusion of polite phrases.

"Why," said He, "do you set traps for Me? Get a denarius and show it to Me."

They brought Him the coin.

"Whose," said He, "is this image and superscription?"

"Cæsar's," said they.

"Render unto Cæsar," said Jesus, "the things that are Cæsar's; and to God the things that are God's."

Thus He again extricated Himself from what was apparently a hopeless dilemma, and His opponents were amazed at what seemed to them a superhuman, demonic

ingenuity ; He had not only extricated Himself, but had succeeded in putting them in the wrong. The Pharisees, in the light of Jesus' answer, had acknowledged the imperial government by using Roman coins ; and the crowd would readily identify the Herodians as those who did not give God His due.

But Jesus' answer was no mere quibble ; the Pharisees and Herodians were insincere, but their question raised a real difficulty, which Jesus met by providing, once for all, a solution for such problems—the secular authority might be obeyed in its merely material demands ; its decrees must be ignored when they clash with the diviner dictates of the quickened conscience and the enlightened soul.

(e) *The Sadducees' Question ; xii. 18-27.* Later on Jesus was assailed by another set of *soi-disant* anxious inquirers ; this time the company were Sadducees—the name occurs only here in Mark ; but the Sadducees were the dominant element of the Jerusalem priesthood, and the party must have been represented in the first deputation. But the officials, and the Pharisees too in their way, were men of affairs and ecclesiastics ; they, therefore, did not suppose that a prophet in the flood tide of his popularity would be upset by theological conundrums ; their questions turned on practical politics, and an incautious answer would have meant disaster to Jesus and to the cause of the Kingdom.

But the new problem submitted to Him was comparatively trivial ; these Sadducees represented the scholarly rather than the political wing of the party ; they may have taken a real interest in speculative theology. Now in matters of doctrine the Sadducees represented an older orthodoxy, which stigmatized the Pharisees as heretical innovators. Jesus, it seems, had accepted the Alexandrine and Pharisaic doctrine of the Resurrection, which the Sadducees rejected as an unsound novelty. It was on this

point that they attacked Him ; they were in happy possession of an ingenious puzzle, by which they had often posed bewildered Pharisees, at any rate, in their own estimation. They now looked forward to a similar triumph over the Galilæan prophet.

“Teacher,” said they, “Moses wrote that if a man died childless, his brother should marry his widow, and that the dead man’s family should be continued by the children of this new marriage. There were seven brothers ; the first married and died childless ; the second took his wife, and also died childless ; so also the third, and the rest of the seven. None of them had any children by her. Last of all the woman died also. In the Resurrection whose wife shall she be ? She was married in turn to each of the seven.”

There is a touch of scorn in the answer of Jesus, which is given with a fulness and freedom in marked contrast to the cautious reserve shown towards the priests and Pharisees.

“Surely you fall into error because you do not understand the Scriptures or the power of God ; when the dead rise they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven. And concerning the raising of the dead, have you not read in the Book of Moses, in the section of the Bush, how God said to him, ‘I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob’ ? He is not the God of dead men, but of living men. Your views are quite wrong.”

Jesus does not hesitate to give a prompt, authoritative decision as to the conditions of the future life, but it is not clear whether the decision is given as a new *obiter dictum*, or as following some authority. Probably it was a new decision, otherwise it would have been known to the Sadducees. On the general question of the future life the passage cited is less explicit than the last chapter of

Daniel. Jesus did not use this book, because the canon of the Sadducees, the representatives of a stricter and more ancient orthodoxy than that of the Pharisees, did not recognise Daniel as Scripture.

W. H. BENNETT.

IS THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING OPTIMISTIC ?

“CHRISTIANITY,” says Von Hartmann, “like every genuine religion, grew out of a pessimistic view of the universe and, rooted in this Christian religiosity, has continued to draw thence its nourishment until the Renaissance, with its pagan delight in things of the world, came into conflict with the Christian contempt for, and effort to escape from the world ; when a dwindling faith in transcendent bliss made the outlook of terrestrial happiness more attractive.” Then it was that the process of dissolution in Christianity began, and thence the necessity of finding a new form of religion,¹ in the opinion of this writer.

It will be our aim in the present paper to show, on the contrary, that pessimism is not a distinguishing mark of Christianity, as in a former paper we discussed the subject of Hebrew pessimism by way of proving indirectly that it is not true that the Old Testament is essentially optimistic. We shall here endeavour to show that although sorrow and sadness are predominating notes in the utterances of Christ and His immediate followers, the sounds of joy and gladness are by no means wanting, that Christ’s message was an Evangel, a message of joy, that the occurrence of such words as *χαρά*, *ἀγαλλίαν*, *μακαρίζειν*, or such expressions as “sorrowful yet always *rejoicing*,” “*joyful* in tribulation,” warnings against the tendency to succumb under a weight of care (*μέριμνα*) and exhortations against despondency in the Epistles (a recent writer in the *Spectator* speaks of the optimism in the Epistle to the Hebrews) display a harmonious blending of sadness with gladness, of cheerfulness in suffering, and a hopeful assurance of a final victory in the conflict with the world—the thirteen parables of the

¹ *Die Selbstzersetzung des Christenthums und die Religion der Zukunft*, p. 88.

Kingdom of God indicate the triumph of good over evil—the survival of the fittest (see Mathew x. 22, and xiii. 43)—which are utterly at variance with the principles of thoroughgoing pessimism. True, in the later developments of mediaeval Christianity, and in the writings of such as Buonaventura and Thomas à Kempis, pessimistic mysticism makes its appearance. But the fathers of the first four centuries and the Reformers, like Luther, manifest optimistic tendencies. In fact, Protestantism is condemned by modern pessimists together with Rationalism for its advocacy of optimistic views of life and its alliances with the forces of material progress. This easy accommodation to the spirit of worldliness, it is said, is in complete contrast with the self-denying asceticism and rule of self-mortification which are the true marks of primitive Christianity. Here it is forgotten that in its beginnings Christianity was *une force régénératrice*, reviving the drooping spirit of the ancient world, sunk into pessimistic despondency, as the works of Tacitus, M. Aurelius, Pliny, and Seneca amply testify.

As it was pessimistic scepticism which brought about the decay of the ancient civilization, so it was the vigour of the new faith in the healing power of Christ, applied to the needs of suffering humanity, which effected a moral and social regeneration. Christianity fully recognizes the existence of physical and spiritual evils, but suggests at the same time the means for their removal; it accentuates the ennobling and refining power of pain, and in its promise of a future life deprives death of its sting. It is, indeed, optimistic so far as it regards the world as the object of redemption and sees a teleological aim in the course of nature, “that far-off event to which the whole creation moves,” and a remedy of universal evil in the promise of “a new heaven and a new earth in which dwelleth righteousness.” Thus every *πάθος* becomes an *εῖδος*, as Dr. Gass

in his treatise on the subject puts it, the triumphs of faith culminate in triumphs, the dissonances of life end in peace, harmony is re-established as the passions of men are being pacified and subdued by a higher law. The whole creation is represented by St. Paul as groaning and travailing in pain, waiting for deliverance from the bondage of corruption. But then in relation to this he also says: "The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed to us" (Rom. viii. 18 seq.)

In fact, both the elements of optimism and pessimism are in a measure contained in Christianity, as, indeed, they are both to be found in human nature. Tolstoi's view of Christianity as a "world-shunning" system is one-sided, as was that of Schopenhauer, whose portrait occupies a prominent place in his sitting-room. The same is true of Ibsen's presentation of the tragical in life; yet both in their idealism approach the Christian standpoint. "The renunciation of personal happiness and life," says Tolstoi, "is, for a rational being, as natural a property of his life as flying on its wings, instead of running on its feet, is for a bird." Self-renunciation, though not stated with the same rigour, as a force arrayed against the malign influences of the world, has its appropriate place assigned to it in the Christian scheme. Yet Tertullian, living in the age of Nero, says in his Apology: "Unam omnium rempublicam agnoscimus, mundum"; St. Augustine in *De Civitate Dei* pronounces a solemn funeral oration over the ancient world, yet in other of his writings expatiates with philosophical cheerfulness on the cosmological order of the universe by means of which evil is transmuted into good. If Pascal and the Port Royalists, like Calvin and the Puritans, display a temperamental tendency towards gloomy pessimism, Leibnitz and the optimists of the eighteenth century

restore the balance, though in so doing they may go too far in an opposite direction.

Again, if the rationalistic school of theology was too much inclined to speak of ours as the best of worlds, the Agnostics of our own day, tossed about in the "turbid torrent of doubt and despair," are far too ready to yield to mental despondency. "It is good!" said Kant on his death-bed—it is the last word of the eighteenth century. The nineteenth is essentially pessimistic. The oriental notion of the veil of Maja, hiding the unrealities of existence and deluding the senses, has been exchanged for "the veil of sadness," spread over the Cosmos.

"The cosmos," said the late Mr. F. W. H. Myers, in his collection of Essays on "Science and a Future Life," "we now say, is a system of ether and atoms, in which the sum of matter and the sum of energy are constant quantities. And the cosmos is the scene of universal evolution. Hence it seems to follow that no human soul or will can add a fresh energy of its own . . . it seems to follow, too, that even the highest of these automata (who fancy that they direct the currents along which they inevitably flow) have been brought into a momentary existence by no Heavenly Father, no providential scheme; but in the course of a longer and unconscious process, which in itself bears no relation to human happiness or virtue," and in consequence of this "*we find pessimistic systems more vigorous than any other*, and the intellect of France, Russia, Germany deeply honey-combed with a tacit despair." In order that the race may find a new practical ideal, he says further on, "We must somehow achieve a profound readjustment of our general views of the meaning of life and of the structure of the universe."

But the last word of science is simply a passive resignation, or acquiescence in "the final insoluble mystery of the Universe," at best a cheerful obedience to "cosmic law." But this view the modern symbolist rejects and characterizes as the "bankruptcy of science" in its failure to satisfy the spiritual needs of men.

"Vain is your Science, vain your Art.
Your triumphs and your glories vain,
To feed the hunger of their heart,
And famine of their brain."

The Christian view of the "world process" is utterly at variance with this. The parabolic teaching of Christ, as in the lilies of the field and the poems of St. Francis with his love for nature, are instances of its tendency to dispel the gloom caused by pessimistic materialism, or science robbed of the consolations of a spiritualistic philosophy. Von Hartmann, indeed, speaks of pessimism as the grave-digger of materialism, because it dissuades man from his futile "hunt after happiness." He holds up, too, his own system, the "ethics of pain," as best calculated to cure the world of the "pseudo-morality" founded on hedonistic principle, as Schopenhauer derives sanctification from suffering. Christianity, too, has been justly called "the religion of suffering," self-renunciation and a readiness to sacrifice life is part of its system. "To die is gain" is the cheerful spirit acquiescence in some of its martyrs; but it is the willingness to renounce life for God and goodness, and for the promotion of higher life in others. "No cross, no crown," is its motto, but then it holds to the promise of the crown of life—*finis coronat opus*.

"There is nothing like the bitterness of life for taking away the bitterness of death," says a well-known pessimistic writer of modern fiction. There is no such conception of the bitterness of life or death to be found in any expression contained in the Christian writings.

"To me the wretchedness and apparent failure of the world is terrible," says Bishop Westcott, writing to his wife in 1888; but he adds: "However, I hope that life will come."

In order to show what Christianity has in common with pessimism, and wherein it essentially differs from it, we may compare briefly Von Hartmann's pessimistic presentment of the teleological process and its finality compared with the eudaimonistic view of the course of this world and its goal from the Christian standpoint. The peculi-

arity of Von Hartmann's system is the blending of pessimistic views of the Universe with optimistic principles of evolution so as to fit them into his ethical scheme, by means of which he hopes to attain his ideal annihilation. For his conception of the redemption of the world is the united effort of "cultured piety" to attain to the happy state of non-existence. He uses such theological terms as "the grace of salvation," and "faith"—*Erlösungsgnade* and *Gemüthsglaube*,—and speaks of these as necessary to salvation; the former being dependent on the universal spirit, the latter coming from man, and both acting together, resulting in the return of all sentient being with the immanent spirit to a state of blissful unconsciousness. Or, as he puts it elsewhere, the tragedy of the world's process ends in the peace of non-being. In this cosmological view there is no room left for "rejoicing in hope" of blessedness here, or hereafter, *Weltfreude* becomes *Weltfriede*, not everlasting joy but eternal rest—the unbroken peace of Nirvâna.

Christian Eudaimonism, too, expects a deliverance, but it is the liberation of the individual soul and that of the world at large from evil. It is not a deliverance from life itself, except for the purpose of attaining the higher life, "the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body" (2 Cor. iv. 10). Christianity estimates life and the world at their true value from the point of view of the higher optimism, according to which self-renunciation and the renunciation of the world become means to an end, not the end itself. To overcome self and the world is to further individual and universal progress, ethically and spiritually. "In the world ye shall have tribulation," but "*Be of good cheer*, I have overcome the world." The world thus becomes a high school of ethical culture, and the saints being made perfect learn to regard the existence of evil, even moral evil—*O felix culpa!*

—as instrumental thereunto. Of the several pessimistic views of the world, as an inn, a house of correction, a mad-house, or a sink of corruption, it adopts, with certain limitations, the first two. Our transitory existence here serves the purpose of improvement; it becomes a suitable environment for moral training (see 2 Cor. v. 1 *seq.*), in calling forth the feelings of love and pity, stimulating sympathy and compassion, leading up to corresponding effort to ameliorate the condition and alleviate the suffering of others. Christianity is not misanthropical in its pessimism, but philanthropic in its ethical optimism.

“Whoever looks at serious misfortunes from a distance,” said the blind philosopher E. Dühring in his book on the *Value of Life*, “and only knows it from observation, is ready enough with a malicious wholesale condemnation of this world and its wickedness. He speaks of its demonic origin and its evil nature, and so freely dispatiates on its genesis and mutations adversely, because it does not affect him immediately and personally. He feels as happy in his pessimistic twilight, when unfriendly views of life assume a romantic glamour, as owls and bats feel happy in the dark after sunset.”

Pessimism thus becomes simply an anodyne for selfish minds indulging in moody sadness which is incapable of altruistic effort.

According to the Christian view, life is a state of probation, preparatory for another state of existence; hence its evils have a disciplinary quality, in helping to develop “the powers of the world to come,” thus inspiring that “serious joyousness” which Dr. South associates with paradisial bliss. It is quite distinct from the calm aesthetic pleasure, or philosophical contemplation, which is the only source of unmixed delight of which we are capable, according to Schopenhauer. It also differs from the ideal optimism of Emerson, the serenity of spirit arising from the conviction that the universe benefits in what the individual loses, that nature which is all-good will bring good out of evil in the working of her inexorable laws. Therefore, he says: “Let

us build altars to Beautiful Necessity," for "Fate involves melioration," and in the "ascending order" all works out for the best. Christianity does not take up the standpoint of satisfied optimism or dissatisfied pessimism. It partly agrees with the pessimist when he dwells on the illusionary character of perfect happiness in this life, and for this reason, that "without sorrow the divine seriousness of life would be unknown." But, whilst admitting that life contains many joys as well as sorrows, it insists on the reality, if it does not define the nature, of felicity in the life beyond the grave. This hope pessimism discards as an unreasonable and vain desire for posthumous existence. The supreme joy of Christianity is not eternal and unbroken sleep at death—the pessimist's ideal, but "them that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with Him" (1 Thess. iv. 14, R.V.).

Thus Christianity avoids the fallacy of extremes, the gloomy outlook of orientalism, yearning for absorption in the inane as well as the blithely light-mindedness of Hellenism, and their influence on modern thought. It is equally distant from the gloomy pessimism which despairs of human nature and an easygoing optimism which overlooks the sad aspects of human existence. "It is the half-seriousness that is gloomy," says Bishop Brooks, the great American preacher, "the full seriousness, the life lived in its deepest consciousness, is full of joy, as it is full of seriousness." Religious minds brooding over the anguish of life and the shadows cast athwart the path of progress, cannot escape from moments of sadness and fits of melancholy thoughts. But there are, too, the brighter moments of "the cheerfulness of soul" and "buoyancy of spirit" for saints and sages, as in the case of our Lord, who "rejoiced in spirit" upon the return of the Seventy from their successful mission, yet exhorts His disciples: "Howbeit in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but

rejoice that your names are written in heaven" (Luke x. 20); or when He extorts His followers with the hope of a final restitution and compensation for life's trials (*vide* Luke xiv. 18). All periods of decay, it has been said, have been pessimistic; all periods of active productivity optimistic. The Christian religion was not, as Harnack puts it, "the religion of a despairing section of the Jewish nation . . . the last effort of a decadent age driven by distress into a renunciation of this earth, and then trying to storm heaven . . . a religion of miserabilism." It is because it is the opposite of all this that it can impart the vigour which is indispensable to progress. For this reason it has nothing in common with the dismal wanton pessimism attracted by evil in its craving for "cerebral voluptuousness"—the pessimism of decadents; nor, on the other hand, does it favour an idle, self-sated optimism given to sensuous indulgence. Christianity does not regard this either as the best or the worst of worlds. In Nature, and Society, in the spiritual and moral environment, in the historical process without and individual development within, we meet serious hindrances and opposing forces. These are the cause of disturbance and disharmonies without and discords within; they are known to exercise a baneful influence and serve as impediments to progress.

"The gospel of work" offers unremitting activity as a consolation, with Voltaire, a pessimist of the eighteenth century, it seems to say: "Let us work without reasoning,—it is the only way of rendering life supportable." The dynamic optimism of Christianity serves as a spur to effort under the Divine taskmaster's eye in helping forward the general plan, the new order of things to be evolved from the old. Pessimistic fatalism, as it holds that all effort is a futile attempt to amend what is beyond repair, and destined to perish in the end, is apt to enervate and enfeeble. Christianity suggests for man's highest

aim a new type of life in the light of moral liberty by means of heroic action and noble suffering effecting the final victory of the spiritual forces in the universe through the power of Divine grace and love. Thus, in the words of Professor R. Eucken,¹ the world becomes the workshop of spiritual activity, and the present dialectical process consists in the developing of the spiritual force which is to effect this.

Here, then, we have a less depressing aspect of life's struggle against the powers of evil than is contained in "the pagan melancholy" or capacity for painful thought, "the malady of soul" of our cultivated classes, as the result of growing refinements of the senses and the intellect with the weakening of religious beliefs in the present day. There is nothing in the Christian writings comparable to what we see exhibited in the love of the lugubrious in contemporary literature and art. Christianity stands between the extremes of pessimism and optimism, as a *meliorative* system. It does not with pessimism regard the world as a madhouse, or a hospital for incurables, still less as a charnel-house where all the inmates are condemned to die. It regards it rather as a sanatorium, or convalescent home, for the complete restoration to health. Life, liberty, disinterested love are the ultimate issues expected from this treatment. The limitations of sin, sorrow, and suffering serve the purpose of maturing human nature so as to render it fit for a higher state of existence.

In this view of life and the Cosmos there is something bracing and apt to produce a cheerful fortitude of mind which enables a man like Hamerton, amid the ills of life and the baffling incoherency of things, to say near its close :

"With the passing of years, the decay of strength, the loss of all

¹ *Der Kampf um einen Geistigen Lebensinhalt, neue Grundlegung einer Weltanschauung*, p. 343.

my old native and pleasant habits, there grows more and more upon me that belief in the kindness of this scheme of things, and the goodness of our veiled God, which is an excellent and pacifying compensation" (*Autobiography and Memoir*, p. 535).

Thus the world becomes a wide field for exercising noble activities, and bearing suffering and privations with enduring courage, a theatre for the most vigorous exertion of our powers, and training them for the ultimate performance of higher duties in a more perfect state, and the enjoyment of that felicity which consists in noble being and service, a view of life at once serious and serene, and most fitly expressed, perhaps, in the phraseology of the Hebrew psalmist, anticipating as it were the Christian conception of life, its course, and its goal: "Thou wilt show me the path of life, in Thy presence is fulness of joy, at Thy right hand pleasures for evermore" (Ps. xvi. 11).

M. KAUFMANN.

THE CENSUS OF THE ISRAELITES.

THE numbers of the Israelites stated in Exodus are evidently based on the more detailed statements of the census in Numbers (chaps. i.-iii.) before the wandering; and with this must be also taken the census after the wandering at the end of Numbers (chap. xxvi.). These statements have long been felt to be impossible as they stand, and forty years ago an arbitrary reduction to a tenth of the numbers was proposed by an orthodox traveller—Sandie. Later writers have very carefully eschewed the whole question, and not a hint on the treatment of the statements is to be found in either of the recent Bible Encyclopaedias.

While in Sinai last winter the question of the ancient conditions was carefully considered, and the general impression is that no considerable change has taken place in climate or productiveness within historic times.

The main factors are that only 4,000 to 7,000 persons can live in Sinai now, according to different estimates; that the Israelites were not more numerous than the ancient inhabitants, as in the Amalekite battle they were nearly matched (I owe this point to my friend, Mr. Currelly); and that only a few thousand people could have occupied Goshen, whereas any number, such as is given in Exodus, would imply depopulating most of the delta, and of this we find no trace at the time. In short, not more than a few thousand people could be got out of Goshen or into Sinai.

Let us look at the numbers of the tribal census more closely. I have rearranged the order to make the argument more clear.

NUMBERS i.-iii.		NUMBERS xxvi.	
Manasseh	32,200	Simeon	22,200
Simeon	59,300	Issachar	64,300
Benjamin	35,400	Naphtali	45,400
Naphtali	53,400	Asher	53,400
Issachar	54,400	Dan	64,400
Zebulun	57,400	Ephraim	32,500
Ephraim	40,500	Gad	40,500
Asher	41,500	Zebulun	60,500
Reuben	46,500	Judah	76,500
Judah	74,600	Benjamin	45,600
Gad	45,650	Manasseh	52,700
Dan	62,700	Reuben	43,700

On reviewing these numbers a strange feature appears : there is no case of an exact thousand, or 100, nor of 800 or 900, and more than half the hundreds fall on 400 or 500. This is a strange distribution of the hundreds, when fourteen out of twenty-four fall on only two of the ten digits. The chances against this being casual are more than a thousand to one ; and there is evidently some strong selective influence on the hundreds apart from the thousands. Compare these with a chance set of digits. Against this third place of the figures I will take the third place of figures of the National Debt, as certainly a chance set of figures, in three successive periods of 24 years.

Digits.	Two Censuses.	National Debt.		
0	0	4	1	4
1	0	1	0	3
2	2	3	5	1
3	2	1	6	2
4	7	2	3	2
5	7	1	4	0
6	3	4	1	3
7	3	3	1	3
8	0	4	1	4
9	0	1	2	2

Here we see an even chance distribution in the National Debt, never more than 4 of one digit, and only one digit

missing in two of the three sets of figures; while the census hundreds are concentrated on the middle of the digits, and entirely desert the higher and lower numbers.

The only conclusion from this is that *the hundreds of the census lists have an independent origin, apart from the thousands.*

What then are the thousands? *Alaf* has two or three meanings, and "a family" is as good a rendering as "a thousand." What if the "thousands" were "families" in the original census? We should then have a double census, the exact number of families or tents, and the round number of hundreds of persons in each tribe. This would completely explain the fact that the hundreds are independent numbers.

But how will this work out regarding the number of persons in a family? The poorest tribe in the first census has five to a family, the least that can keep it up; the richest has 14 to a family, which is quite possible if there were many children, beside herdsmen and hangers-on of the "mixed multitude." In the second census the families are from 5 to 17 persons. The average is 9 in both census lists.

Now all this is quite reasonable; and the variation in the size of family from least to greatest, as 1 to 3, is much less than the possible variation of the digits 0 to 9. These results are not the product of chance numbers, but of numbers that agree together in a rational result.

The conclusion then is that the total of the Israelites before the wandering was 598 tents—5,550 persons; and after the wandering 596 tents—5,730 persons. The original census lists, giving tents and persons, were later misunderstood, and the tents were read as thousands, and prefixed to the hundreds of the true census. Such a form of census in double column would be in the manner of account keeping of the period, as seen in Egyptian accounts. The

total of persons in the original form of the census would be well in accord with the possibilities of Goshen and of Sinai.

If this view of the original document be accepted, there is an instrument in our hands for dividing clearly between original and later statements of the Israelite history in the Pentateuch. On one hand we see that (1) the twelve tribes were existing at the Exodus, and are not due to accretion in the desert, or to a Solomonic system. Their fixation may well be due to a monthly *corvée* of forced labour in Egypt.

(2) The account of the plague is intelligible; 14 whole families were extinguished in a total mortality of 700 persons. And there is nothing impossible in the 70 elders.

But, on the other hand, we see that—

(1) The numbers of the first-born males, 22,273, are quite as impossible as they are in the existing text. They imply a total population of 100,000 to 200,000, which does not fit the total of 2 or 3 millions required by the present text, or the 5 or 6 thousand which we have now reached. Moreover the numbers given for the tribe of Levi cannot be reduced like those of the other tribes, and they must have been introduced from some much later census in Palestine. There is then no trace of Levi at the Exodus, and Levi was a caste selected from the twelve tribes which were in existence at the Exodus.

(2) The whole statement of the half shekel tax must also be a later introduction, as it is linked to the later misunderstanding of the census.

Various other conclusions will follow from these. But I have said enough to show how much reconstruction of historical views must follow from the understanding of these census lists, and what a basis for a strict criticism they form for us.

Probably any one accustomed to deal with figures will feel the force of this, as it seems impossible otherwise to account for the hundreds of these lists falling generally on 4 or 5, and entirely omitting the higher and lower digits.

W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE.

*THE MEANING OF "HATRED" IN THE NEW
TESTAMENT.*

THINK not that I came to send peace on the earth :
I come not to send peace, but a sword !
For I came to set a man at variance against his father :
And the daughter against her mother ;
And the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law ;
And a man's foes shall be they of his own household :
He that loveth father or mother more than me,

Is not worthy of me :]

And he that loveth son or daughter more than me,

Is not worthy of me.

And he that doth not take his cross and follow after me,

Is not worthy of me.

He that findeth his life,

Shall lose it.

And he that loseth his life for my sake

Shall find it.

St. Matt. x. 34-39.

Now there went with Him great multitudes, and He turned and said unto them, If any man cometh unto me and hateth not his own father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.

St. Luke xiv. 25, 26.

As a rule the synoptic parallelisms containing our Lord's own words are much closer than the narrative portions common to two or to three Evangelists. In some cases these parallelisms are identical or nearly identical ; see, for example, Mark i. 23-28 and Luke iv. 25-37 ; Matt. ix. 14-17, Mark ii. 18-22, Luke v. 33-39 ; Matt. xii. 46-50, Mark iii. 31-35, Luke viii. 19-21 ; Matt. xvi. 17-28, Mark viii. 30-ix. 1, Luke ix. 21-27.

This fact throws into prominence any discrepancies which may occur in such parallelisms. In this respect a comparison between our Lord's words as reported in Matthew x. 37, 38 and in Luke xiv. 26, 27 have a special interest. The passages are parallel, and yet out of fifty-two (Greek) words

in St. Luke's report seven only are found in St. Matthew's version.

Apart from the verbal discrepancies the Evangelists differ in two important particulars. St. Matthew incorporates in our Lord's words a citation from the LXX. version of Micah x. 34-39,¹ and quotes the rest of the saying in a poetical form of great beauty in accordance with the movement of the prophetic passage.

The first of these differences is typical of St. Matthew's plan of presenting the gospel to his Jewish readers, who would understand and appreciate the allusion to one of their old prophets.

The rhythmical form of Hebrew parallelism into which our Lord's words are thrown, raises a question of great importance and interest in regard to St. Matthew's reports of the sayings of Christ. There are very few chapters indeed of this Gospel which do not present some instance of this poetical element.² The Sermon on the Mount is full of such instances, chaps. v.-vii. The question therefore arises whether the poetical form is a transcript of the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord, or whether it was used as a means to facilitate oral tradition. The parallels from St. Matthew and St. Luke with which this paper is concerned seem to show that neither alternative admits of decisive proof. Cases exist where a two-fold and diverse tradition has come down of the words of Jesus, where one only can be literally exact.

As to the verbal discrepancies in the contrasted passages, the difference which has presented the greatest difficulty is that between *ὁ φιλῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμέ* (he that loveth father or mother above me) of St. Matthew, and *εἴ τις . . . οὐ μισεῖ τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα κ.τ.λ.*

¹ Cited by S. Luke on a different occasion, xii. 51-53.

See the Index of Texts in Bishop Jebbs' *Sacred Literature*.

(if any man hateth not his own father and mother, etc.) of St. Luke.

The latter phrase, as given in St. Luke, has been regarded as a "hard saying," and has not seldom been explained away. It is therefore worth while to investigate somewhat fully the precise meaning of the expression and to consider how far at this point the two reports are in agreement.

The general meaning of each passage is seen from its context.

In St. Matthew the words form part of our Lord's charge to the twelve Apostles on sending them forth to preach and to heal the sick (chap. x. 6 foll.). On the one hand, towards the close, He assures them of the Father's providential care; on the other He inspires them with courage, and places before them the reward of loyalty to the Master, and the condemnation of those who deny Him. He prepares them in fact for persecution; He foretells the divisions which His teaching will bring to pass and the issues of discipleship. A man must make his choice: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me."

St. Luke cites this saying of our Lord in a different connexion. Nor is there indeed any reason to suppose that it was uttered once only. According to St. Luke the words were spoken in the course of the last journey to Jerusalem to the 'great multitudes' who were following Jesus—to those men who seemed to regard discipleship as an easy thing, who were going with Jesus to Jerusalem misled by some false Messianic hope, He sets forth the truth first by the strongly decisive form of the saying: "If any man come to me, and hate not his father and mother and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea and his own life also, cannot be my disciple." He then adds two parables, in the same sense, of the rash builder and the rash king, each of whom failed to calculate the cost and difficulty of his under-

taking. In each case the context illustrates the phrase. In St. Matthew, however, it is intended to nerve and strengthen the resolute disciple; in St. Luke it is intended to make the rash and unreflecting count the cost before he arrays himself on the side of Christ.

The expression in St. Matthew, 'loving father or mother more than me' has never presented any difficulty, and yet the exact meaning has sometimes been missed. For the question is not so much of personal attachment to parents, as of adherence to principles which they hold. Personal attachment is not inconsistent with wide disagreement in politics or religion, though, of course, more often than not, such disagreement is followed by estrangement and failure of love.

It is here that we find the true key to the meaning of *μισεῖν* (to hate). 'To hate father and mother' is not to hate them personally, but to oppose the principles which they represent in opposition to Christ—to be 'on the other side' in the great controversy between Christianity and paganism. If this explanation be borne in mind, it will not be necessary to interpret *μισεῖν* as signifying "to act as if one hated," or even "to hate parents so far as they are opposed to Christ." It is needless to say that the highest sanction of natural affection was given by our Lord both by precept (Matt. v. 22, 24, xv. 5; comp. 1 John iii. 18), and by example (John xix. 25–27); and that therefore no thought of bitterness, or rancour, or vengeance, or injury—the usual accompaniments of hate—can enter into the word in this connexion. The inclusion of a man's own life or soul among things to be 'hated' for the sake of Christ illustrates the meaning of the expression, which implies dispassionate, often sorrowful, but not wrathful or vindictive opposition. This point is well expressed by Bengel, (*Gnomon Novi Testamenti, ad loc.*): "Hoc odium non solum comparate et conditionate debet accipi; sed etiam absolute.

Nam quisquis maturam cognitionem, gustum, appetitum Dei et bonorum cœlestium a Christo duxit; is habet generosum idemque tamen ab omni acerbitate remotum sui et omnis creaturæ vanitati subjectæ fastidium atque odium."

It remains to be seen how far *μισεῖν* (to hate), as used by the classical writers and in the LXX., admits of this modified and gentler meaning. In its ethical aspect, as a classical word, *μισεῖν* has a certain range of meaning. Up to a point it was *καλόν* (noble and good) to hate. In the Ajax of Sophocles, Odysseus says: "I was hating when it was right to hate" (*ἐμίσουν ἥνικ' ἦν μισεῖν καλόν*), 1367, but he urges Agamemnon not to press hatred beyond the point of justice—*τοσόνδε μισεῖν ὥστε μὴ δίκην πατεῖν*, 1335. In Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* iv. 8. 7), *μισητόν* is contrasted with *ἡδύ* merely as things pleasing or unpleasing to good taste. Whence we get a meaning for *μισεῖν* to hate or dislike on principle, the personal element being entirely excluded, or, if it comes in, the person being regarded simply as representative of a principle.

In the LXX. *μισεῖν* generally represents the Hebrew *שָׂנֵא*, and is as frequently used of things as of persons; e.g., of hating "unjust gain," Exodus xviii. 21. "Every abomination to the Lord," Deuteronomy xii. 31. "Robbery for burnt offering," Isaiah lxi. 8. It is also frequently used to express vindictive personal hate as of the brethren of Joseph, Genesis xxxvii. 4, 5, and generally of enemies, Lev. xxvi. 17, and elsewhere.

The Greek word, however, as well as its Hebrew equivalent admits of a much gentler interpretation, signifying, in relation to things, moral disapprobation; in relation to persons, rejection in favour of another. Instances of the first are: "They hated (*ἐμίσησαν*) knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord," Proverbs i. 29. "Hate the evil and love the good, and establish judgment in the gate," Amos. v. 15. In regard to persons, two instances

may be quoted which bear closely on the New Testament use of the word: "He loved Rachel more than Leah. . . . And the Lord saw that Leah was hated," Genesis xxix. 30, 31. "If a man have two wives, the one beloved (*ἡγαπημένη*), and the other hated (*μισουμένη*)," Deuteronomy xxi. 15. In both of these cases the contrast between 'love' and 'hate' is little more than the contrast produced by preference.

If we turn to the New Testament, we find the same gradation in the meaning of *μισεῖν*. It ranges from the hatred, of which persecution is the fruit and almost the necessary result (see Matt. v. 43, 44, and Mark x. 22, 23) to the choice which rejects one person and prefers another: "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one and love the other: or else he will hold to one and despise the other" (Matt. iv. 24), and "Jacob I loved, but Esau I hate" (Rom. ix. 13), where the annotation of the word in its original setting (Malachi i. 2) is sterner than in the citation. When St. Paul, in the same Epistle (Rom. vii. 15), speaks of "doing that which he hates," he throws light on the meaning of a disciple of Christ hating his own soul—equally a requirement of Christian discipline with hating father and mother for the sake of Christ. To hate one's own soul is to oppose the baser impulses of mind, will and desire; and to do that which one hates is to yield to the temptation which the higher instinct condemns. Still nearer to the meaning of hate in the passage we are considering is its meaning in the frequent Johannine phrase of the world's hatred of Christ and Christians. In its incipient stage the world's hatred is indifference or calm dislike. Human society hates the disciples and discipline of Christ, but does not actively persecute unless thwarted or reproved. It was trade jealousy, and not doctrine, which stirred the hostility of the Ephesian silversmiths against St. Paul's teaching, and it was the falling revenues of the Bithynian

farmers, who supplied the markets¹ with food for the temple victims, that impelled the imperial legate to persecute.

The inference from this review of the places in which *μισεῖν* occurs, is, that the parallel passages which stand at the head of this paper are much more nearly identical than would appear to the English reader. The fact is that the Greek word and its Hebrew equivalent pass through a variety of meanings not included, at least by literary usage, in the English word 'to hate.' The English dictionaries admit for hate such synonyms only as abhor, detest, abominate, loathe; and consequently in a passage of this kind 'hate' conveys a different notion to the English mind from that which *μισεῖν* conveyed to the mind of a Greek. And although hatred of home for Christ's sake seems too strong a word, it would be misleading in another direction to substitute any weaker phrase as a translation for this, which, itself or its Aramaic equivalent, we must believe to have been Christ's own word. St. Matthew's report referred by the Evangelist to a different occasion may thus have been an equally exact record of our Lord's words; or it may be a softened form intended to convey the Evangelist's impression of the Master's meaning.

Christian history gave the same twofold interpretation to the word. The sword of division began its work in the earliest days. And though instances must have often occurred in family life where the reciprocal 'hatred' of each other's religion would be quite overmastered by the reciprocal love for each other of parent and child, and of husband and wife, still all the elements of tragedy were contained in the possible conflict of principles and feelings involved in obedience to the rule of Christ. And though many would be found in the course of history ready, like

¹ Pliny's letters to Trajan, xcvi. (xcvii.).

Antigone, "to join in love but not in hate," the tendency was for reasoned opposition on the Christian side to arouse vindictive hatred and persecution on the other side.

And unhappily Christian history also shows that 'hating' father and mother for the sake of Christ came to mean division within the Church itself for the sake of a party leader or a doctrinal controversy.¹ And sometimes the most fierce contentions and the most irreparable divisions have existed, where the lines of difference are most slender and all but undefinable. It is the glory of English politics that private friendships should be compatible with political rivalry and "hatred" of opposing principles. And it is the blot and shame of historic Christianity that it should often have been found an impossible condition to contend for a principle without passion, and to 'hate' in the gospel sense without compromising love.

¹ See *Didache*, xvi. 3. ἡ ἀγάπη στραφήσεται εἰς μῖσος ἀξάνουσης γὰρ τῆς ἀνομίας μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους καὶ διώξουσιν καὶ παραδώσουσιν. And on this passage see Dr. Bigg in *Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1905, p. 411.

ARTHUR CARR.

"SPOKEN BY JEREMY THE PROPHET."

AN ancient controversy, of which the traces may be found from early ages of the Christian Church down to recent times, has recently been revived amongst us by the instrumentality of a leading newspaper. I refer to the dispute over the right reading or correct interpretation of a notable passage in the Gospel of Matthew (Matt. xxvii. 9) relating to the purchase of the Field of Blood by Judas the Traitor, which is said to have been foretold in ancient prophecy in the following words :

"Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying :

'And I took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of the priced one whom they priced from the children of Israel, and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord enjoined upon me.'"

The controversy is, of course, as to how the Evangelist, supposed inerrant, could have ascribed to Jeremiah a prophecy of which the nearest parallel is in Zechariah (Zech. xi. 12), (though even in the supposed parallel the agreement between the book and its quotation is not very obvious).

The occasion of the revival of the controversy was as follows: Dr. Armitage Robinson had delivered a series of Saturday afternoon lectures in Westminster Abbey, and in trying to re-state the doctrine of inspiration, so as not to involve inerrancy, he alluded to this passage and pointed out that there had always been leading Christian teachers who had taken the liberty of disbelieving statements made in the Bible, and, having carefully ensconced himself under the wings of Origen or of Augustine, he announced from his selected shelter that St. Matthew could not have been right in referring the prophecy in question to Jeremiah.

Up to this point there was nothing very novel in the treatment of the subject; it was neither epoch-making nor

earthquake-making; it merely stated what every textual critic of any historical standing had maintained, that the right reading in the passage of Matthew was "Jeremiah," and that the generally accepted conclusion was that the first Evangelist had made an incorrect reference. There can be no doubt that both of these critical statements would commonly pass unnoticed. It was singular that they should have been so vigorously challenged, first, under the head of the text; second, under that of the deduction drawn from it. Mrs. Lewis wrote to the *Times* to point out that in her old Syriac Gospels there was no mention of any prophet at all, and that this omission on the part of a very early Eastern version was supported by early Greek and Latin evidence. And it was inferred that the blunder might be removed from the shoulders of St. Matthew and laid upon one of his earlier transcribers or editors who was not so much bound by the law of inerrancy as St. Matthew was supposed to have been. Mrs. Lewis, accordingly, solved the problem by erasing the difficulty. In this she was merely doing again what the earliest critics of the New Testament had attempted. I suspect she is unduly in love with the Inerrancy of the Bible, and perhaps, like Tischendorf, whom in many ways she resembles, is a little prejudiced in favour of evidence which she has herself brought to light. It must, however, in fairness, be stated that she did not appeal for a reversal of the verdicts of previous New Testament critics, without producing fresh evidence, and that evidence has an extraordinary weight of its own. I will not say that Tischendorf would have reversed his judgment under the new warnings from Mount Sinai, though perhaps he might have done so: we may feel sure, however, that it would not have made the slightest impression upon Dr. Hort. I only wish to point out that it does, in my own judgment, make a difference in the balancing of the evidence, to have such a heavy weight put into the scale from an unexpected quarter. And Mrs. Lewis was quite justified in

moving for a new trial, if she thought the matter had, up to the present, been, from a defect in the evidence, wrongly decided. My own view is that the text is right as it stands; a fresh reason for this opinion will come a little lower down.

Mrs. Lewis was followed by Dr. Waller, who accepted the reading "Jeremiah," and brought the Old Testament to book for having wrongly labelled a certain part of the prophecies which pass under the name of Zechariah. The credit of the New Testament was thus saved at the expense of the Old; both are inspired, this and that, but it is the other one that is wrong. We close the door upon the Higher Critics of the New Testament by throwing open the question of Authorship in the Old Testament! Desperate men choose desperate remedies!

Dr. Armitage Robinson referred to these criticisms when he published his lectures¹; he added a note, in which he stated the objections of his critical antagonists, without referring to them by name, and concluded by saying that "it is better, with Origen and Augustine, to admit the difficulty; and then we may try to learn its lesson." He did not tell us what the lesson exactly was, nor why it should take much trying to master it. It is at this point that I propose, uninvited, to come to his assistance.

It has been my habit, for some time past, to warn my students that the Christian literature does not necessarily begin with the New Testament, and certainly not with the Gospels; that there are traces of previous documentary matter from which the accepted and canonical New Testament depends; and that, until we have learnt to recognize and isolate these primitive deposits, we shall constantly be making mistakes in our interpretation of the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers. And, in particular, I tell them that there are two lost documents of the early Christian propaganda, occurring in various forms, but sufficiently alike to constitute a cycle or type,

¹ *Some Thoughts on Inspiration* Longmans.

the traces of which are to be found constantly in the first period of the literature of the Church. Of these the first is the Collection of the Sayings of Jesus, the second is the Book of Testimonies from the Old Testament. The first of these underlies the Gospels, and is especially an instrument for the conversion of the Gentiles; the second is an instrument for the refutation of the Jews.

The Book of Sayings does not come before us at the present time, and I am aware that, in referring to it, I have the opposition of a number of leading scholars to the belief in its antiquity and in the possibility of the recovery of any of its very early forms. I am the less anxious to discuss the matter, as I hold it to be, in one respect, a case of *Time versus Tradition*, and that, when we have reduced our prejudices in favour of the antiquity of the Gospels to more sober limits, we shall ultimately agree well enough as to the Book of Sayings, and its antiquity and value. But the other matter is even more important and far-reaching, and it colours the whole of the early Christian Theology, as well as some of the theology in our own day which can be shown to be derived, in an unbroken line, from early disputes between Jews and Christians, in which the latter employ the Old Testament, or rather, a series of selected passages from the Old Testament, to establish the truth of the new revelation.

There has been for some time a suspicion that such a work existed. For example, the late Dr. Hatch, in his *Essays on Biblical Greek*, expresses himself as follows¹:

"It may naturally be supposed that a race which laid stress on moral progress, whose religious services had variable elements of both prayer and praise, and which was carrying on an *active propaganda*, would have, among other books, *manuals* of morals, of devotion, and of *controversy*. It may also be supposed, if we take into consideration the contemporary habit of making collections of *excerpts*, and the special authority which the Jews attached to their

¹ P. 203. The section is headed "On Composite Quotations from the Septuagint."

sacred books, that some of their manuals would consist of extracts from the Old Testament.

"The existence of composite quotations in the New Testament, and in some of the early Fathers suggests the hypothesis that we have in these relics of such manuals."

This hypothesis of Dr. Hatch has been put forward also by other writers, for the most part independently of his suggestion, and we are in a position to carry that hypothesis into demonstration by the restoration of large fragments of the manuals of which he speaks.

We notice that in Dr. Hatch's idea, such manuals are, in the first instance, a part of the natural equipment of Greek-speaking Jews, whose requirements in active propaganda led to the collection of such excerpts as would form a controversialist's *vade mecum*, based of course upon the Old Testament, by preference in its Greek form. And from the requirements of the Hellenist to those of the full-grown Christian the step is almost imperceptible.

It is to such a hypothesis, confirmed as it can easily be, by a study of apostolic and sub-apostolic literature, especially of such parts as would belong to a *Corpus Anti-Judaicum*, if such a book were to be produced (as it certainly should be produced), that I am in the habit of referring for the elucidation of recurrent textual phenomena which cannot be wholly due to manuscript variations, and for the study of the crystallization of the leading Christian doctrines.

It would be comparatively easy to show, though this is not the place to do it, that such *testimonies* as those I allude to were classified in sections with titles, brief explanations and frequent insertions of questions and comments by the controversialist editor. And it is often from the recurrence of such editorial matter, especially where the editor makes mistakes in his references to authors or in his interpretations of them, that we are able to detect the use of the Book of Testimonies and to isolate the matter which succeeding writers have borrowed

from it. But even when there is no editorial matter, the existence of centos from the Scriptures, combining passages in a set order and with substantially the same textual variations and connecting links, will often betray the use of the lost little book of which we are speaking.

It can be shown, moreover, that it was common to make a brief reference to the author of the extract given, usually under a very simple form, such as "David says in the Psalm," or "Moses says"; and sometimes only the name "David" or "Moses," or whoever it may be, is given for verification; and it need hardly be said that the Book of Testimonies was subject to all the errors that such collections commonly develop, that the names often dropped out, or were attached to the wrong passages; and it would, I think, be possible to write quite an interesting article on the traces of such transcriptional errors in the early Christian literature.

The suggestion then arises (and it will be a startling one only to those to whom the subject is altogether new) that the Gospel of Matthew has been using a Book of Testimonies, in which the history and tragic end of Judas were explained as a fulfilment of ancient prophecy, and that the mistake which has vexed so many righteous souls was not necessarily even an original one in the Gospel, but one which either existed in the Book of Testimonies, or were accidentally made by the Evangelist in using such a book. In the latter event, the matter is not original, though the erroneous use of the matter may perhaps be so described. In the former case, the mistake, if it be one, is higher up, and the text of the Evangelist must be replaced by the text of his source.

Such, in brief, is the explanation which has been in circulation privately for some time, and it is quite possible that it has been publicly made elsewhere. I should not, however, in view of the lack of direct support to the hypothesis, have drawn attention to it, if it had not been

that the requisite verification recently turned up in a Syriac writer, to whom I shall presently allude. And even in this case, I should probably have kept the verification to myself, until I was able to publish a dissertation upon the Book of Testimonies generally, if it had not been that a discussion had been going on in the public press on the subject, and it seemed hardly fair to withhold an important and perhaps a decisive piece of evidence, which is at least as weighty in such a connexion as the textual authority of Augustine or Origen.

The way in which the matter came to my notice was as follows: I had been reading a volume of unpublished writings of the great Syriac father Bar Šalibi, in which he discourses against the Mohammedans, the Jews, the Nestorians, etc.; we may call it briefly a book against "Jews, Turks and Heretics."

In reading the first of the tracts, which was written against the Moslems, I was much struck by the use which the controversialist made of arguments of an exactly similar character to those which I knew to have been employed by the early Christian fathers against the Jews, and I began to suspect that he had, either by tradition, or, which was more probable, in writing, a Syriac collection of early Christian *Testimonies against the Jews*. Certainly he must have been familiar with the primitive methods of Christian propagandism and debate. And this belief was confirmed, and I think finally established, when I came recently to read the tract of Bar Šalibi against the Jews which followed this one against the Moslems. We will show that in this tract Bar-Šalibi definitely admits that he is working off a collection of Testimonies, and we will see what he says on the subject of Judas.

The reader who is interested in the parallel between the Christian Father confuting the Jew, and the Christian bishop disputing with the Moslem, will find an exact parallel in Mrs. Gibson's Arabic tract from Mount Sinai,

which she calls *A tract on the Triune Nature of God*,¹ but which I maintain should be headed simply *Against the Moslems*. In reviewing this book in the *American Journal of Theology* ² it was easy to establish the statement that "behind the writer we see the line of earlier scribes whose themes are inscribed *Contra Judaeos*: he has borrowed from them, used their methods, and incorporated their quotations," and at the close of the review it is claimed as demonstrated that there is an affinity of the tract with the earlier anti-Judaic literature, and that the Eastern Church stood towards the Moslem in much the same position that they had occupied from the beginning toward the men of the synagogue. A similar state of mind to that of the writer of the anonymous tract is betrayed by Bar Salibi. Let us now come to his actual arguments with the Jews, and see how he is in the habit of presenting his case. I am now quoting from a MS in my possession; the writer is establishing the doctrine of the Trinity and the Divine Nature of Jesus from the Scriptures; he presents his case in the following manner:

Jeremiah. And I will raise up to David a branch of righteousness.

David. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

Isaiah. And he did not send an angel, but the Lord himself saved us.

Solomon, speaking as from the mouth of the Son, says, "Before the abysses I was brought forth."

Isaiah. The Lord God hath sent me, and His spirit.

Moses. Thy right hand, O Lord, hath broken in pieces the enemy. (Here the arm and the right hand of the Father is the Son.)

And so the writer goes on, coming at last to the conclusion that "all these things we have made clear from the *testimonies*."

Those who are familiar with the writings of Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, etc., will at once recognize familiar friends amongst the quotations. For example, the

¹ *Studia Sinaitica*, vii.

² *Am. Journ. Theol.*, 1901, pp. 75-76.

quotation from Moses (Exod. xv. 6), with its added explanation, corresponds to the section in Cyprian's *Testimonies* (Bk. ii. 4), which is headed, "Quod Christus idem manus et brachium Dei," though the quotation itself does not appear in Cyprian. (Notice that the 'arm' has not been mentioned in the text which Bar Şalibi quotes). In the same way the editorial remark that Solomon speaks in the person of the Son, will be found in the *Testimonies* against the Jews ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa in the form: "Speaking in the person of Wisdom," *that is, of the Son* [he said], "When he was preparing the heaven, I was by him." The passage from Isaiah lxiii. 9 is a well-known Christological argument, employed by Irenaeus (III. xxii. 1), Cyprian (*Testimonies*, ii. 7) and elsewhere. And so we might accumulate a mass of references in confirmation of our statement that Bar Şalibi is here using not only the method of *Testimonies* against the Jews, but an actual collection. The minute agreements between himself and early Christian fathers and centoists can hardly be explained in any other way.

A little lower down he comes to testimonies on the Passion and the Betrayal, and proceeds as follows:

Am. (v. 12): Concerning Judas who betrayed Him, Amos prophesied, the oppressor of the righteous has taken a bribe.

Zech. (xii. 12): and Zechariah; If it be pleasing in your eyes, give me my price; and if not, you defraud me: and they weighed me thirty pieces of silver, and I took the thirty pieces of silver and cast them into the treasury.

And Jeremiah said: And they gave me the thirty pieces of silver, the price of the valued one, whom they valued from the sons of Israel, and I gave them for the potter's field.

Isa. (lii. 10): And Isaiah said: Woe to the wicked: because the evil of the work of their hands shall be recompensed.

Ps. lxxviii. 27, and David: Command evil upon him, etc. And *Ps.* cix. 8: And his dwellings and his ministry let another take.

Prov. (vi. 12, 13): And Solomon says: A foolish person: a wicked man walks in slander: and he makes signs with his eyes and strikes with his fist.

Deut. (xxvii. 25): And Moses says: Cursed is every one that taketh a bribe to kill the soul of the righteous.

Here then we have Bar Ṣalibi's testimonies concerning Judas, and I think there will be little difficulty in conceding that they represent an older student than Bar Ṣalibi himself. The text of the Testimonies follows closely the text of the Peshito, the sentence quoted from Jeremiah being a transcript from the Gospel of Matthew in that version. It does not, however, follow that it was originally taken from Matthew, for in the Syriac versions the name of the prophet is wanting. The structure of Bar Ṣalibi's work implies, as we have shown above, a collection of written testimonies in Greek, and it is quite natural that Bar Ṣalibi, or his sources, should give the well-known Syriac equivalents for them. One of the most interesting confirmations of the antiquity of the Book of Testimonies in Syriac, will arise from the fact that it was clearly known to the author of the Doctrine of Addai. He represents Addai as using the method of Testimonies for the conversion of the people of Edessa, and actually gives the quotation from Isaiah xlviii. 16, which we have alluded to above, in the following form :

"Also the prophets of old spake thus: that 'the Lord our God and His Spirit hath sent us.' And if I speak anything which is not written in the prophets, the Jews, who are standing among you and hear me, will not receive it."¹

Here then we come upon the suggestion that there existed a primitive collection of Testimonies, which has been used in its Greek form by St. Matthew, and in its Syriac form by Bar Ṣalibi. And the error of St. Matthew, if it be an error, is due to his use of the Book of Testimonies. At this point the result of the investigation is somewhat different from what I expected. I was on the look out for evidence to show that the ascription to Jeremiah was one of those cases of which the *Testimonies*

¹ Cf. Acts xxvi. 22, 23, where the heading of a section of Testimonies is in the text.

furnish frequent instances where a title has been misplaced; that is to say, I thought that the title, Zechariah, had slipped, or had been displaced by the title of a neighbouring testimony from Jeremiah. That would be a very easy solution to the whole difficulty; but it appears to be too simple; for (1) the evidence has increased for writing Jeremiah, not only in Matthew, where it certainly belongs, but in the previous document. (2) The title of Zechariah has not been displaced, for both Zechariah and Jeremiah are there. (3) There appears to be no other Jeremiah passage in the neighbourhood from which the title can have come. Moreover when we examine the text of the prophecy-loving Matthew, on the hypothesis that he is using a collection of Testimonies, we find that in Matthew xxvii. 16 (*οἱ δὲ ἔστησαν αὐτῇ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια*) there is a distinct trace of Zechariah xi. 12, as in Bar Ṣalibi's extract, without *τὸν μισθόν μου*. So that it really seems as if Matthew had used from his little text-book, first a sentence from Zechariah, and second, one from Jeremiah (or if you prefer it, Pseudo-Jeremiah).

My suggestion, then, is that the printed Greek text of Matthew is correct, but that it depends upon a lost collection of Testimonies, and it is no longer as obvious as it has sometimes been assumed to be, that the reference to Jeremiah ought to be explained away by the interpreter, where the textual critic has insisted on retaining it.

Beyond this we do not see our way very clearly; we have, however, gained a point, and, as Dr. Robinson would say, "we must try and learn the lesson."

One part of the lesson would appear to be that the Book of Testimonies is older than much of the New Testament literature; whether we ought also to say that the Gospel of Matthew is later than has been commonly supposed is an interesting question which also requires more time and further deliberation.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

AUTHORITY AND INFALLIBILITY.

THE Christian Church has passed through many periods of controversy, but it is doubtful if any controversy which has arisen in her midst was more anxious or more vital than that which divided Christian from Christian in the days of St. Paul. As we review the circumstances we find it hard, indeed, to take much interest in the question at issue, for it seems to be one to which the answer was quite plain. Is circumcision an essential preliminary for one who would share the graces and the hopes of the Christian Gospel? The question seems absurd to us who look back from the vantage ground of history. Certainly, we say, St. Paul was right and his opponents were narrow-minded persons whose bigotry would have made of Christianity a mere sect of Judaism. For his largeheartedness we give God thanks, while we wonder that any Christian could ever have been found so unconscious of the implications of his creed as to imagine that this Jewish ordinance was of perpetual and universal obligation.

And yet the problem was not so simple. In the decision of the practical question of circumcision a great principle seemed to be at stake—a principle so momentous that we need not be surprised at the hesitation which was felt in its adoption. For St. Paul's opponents urged that the licence which he was willing to concede was inconsistent with the plainest teaching of their inspired Scripture. "Do you really propose—we can hear them asking the question—to repeal the ordinance which is the centre of the law? This is to make little of the Scripture, which *cannot be broken*. The enactment is quite clear. *He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised, and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. The uncircumcised male . . . shall be cut*

*off from his people.*¹ To discredit this is to despise the sacred law. What security have we for the permanent value of other Scriptures if this is to be disregarded? To refuse to be bound by this enactment is to undermine the authority of the books in which it has pleased God that His will should be revealed." And yet this reasoning was not accepted by the Church. St. Paul in opposing it was but following the teaching of his Master, who bade men look for the principles underlying the precepts of the Old Testament and find in them the permanent and essential truths of revelation. This was really to fulfil the law, although it seemed to destroy it. And St. Paul prevailed, and the freedom of the gospel was asserted once for all. Nor were the forebodings of the prophets of evil verified. They were wrong, for the authority of the Old Testament remained unimpaired; and by this sore controversy the Christian Church learnt something of the true purpose and place of that authority.

History does not repeat itself, although the proverb says so; but as human nature remains the same, the same questions as to the meaning of authority, the binding force of tradition, the relation between authority and infallibility continually recur. And it is worth our while to observe how these questions presented themselves many centuries afterwards at the great awakening of Europe in the sixteenth century. For, at the Reformation the objections which were urged against a breach with the Papacy were not altogether dissimilar to the objections which St. Paul's opponents presented to his policy of faith and courage.

The situation of any thoughtful and pious Christian at the beginning of the Reformation struggle was a difficult one. On the one hand the dawn of the new learning was illuminating the mind of Europe. Not only science, but literature also was revealing its treasures to those who had

¹ Gen. xvii. 13, 14.

eyes to see. The art of printing made it possible for the first time in history for knowledge to be diffused widely ; books were brought within the reach of simple and learned alike. For a religious man to neglect the new light that was being shed from every quarter upon the great topics of religion—God and the world and the soul and their relations one to the other—was to be a traitor to the truth. And yet this new knowledge was hard to co-ordinate with the scholastic traditions upon which former generations had been nourished. It became clearer every day that the teaching of the mediæval Church about matters of science and history was not consistent with what the learned men of the day were expounding to the world. Which was an honest man to choose? For the Church with whose instruction all his most sacred memories were associated met him with her *Anathema sit*. He had been taught that she was practically infallible ; and he *knew* that in her bosom he had found rest, that in her ordinances he had received the grace of Christ, that in her guidance he had found his truest safety. There was much, indeed, in her practice which he could not reconcile to his conscience, as there was much in her teaching which he could no longer believe. And yet was she not, after all, the instrument chosen by God, for the recovery of the world from sin? Was she not, despite her mistakes and her shortcomings, the one witness for Jesus Christ? It was a great dilemma, and we cannot wonder that men's hearts failed them for fear, and for the things which were coming upon the earth.

Again, we look back from the vantage point of time, and we see that the difficulty which proved too much for many earnest souls was not unlike the difficulty which was felt by the Pharisees of St. Paul's time. They identified the authority of the Church with her infallibility. They feared that they could not retain the distinctive graces and hopes

of the Christian faith if they admitted any modification of the traditions with which it had been surrounded in the lapse of years. The Church which they had trusted as infallible stood to them for Christianity itself. They could not admit that she had ever been mistaken, or that any of her ordinances were only of temporary value, without losing their confidence in the eternal truths of which she had been the minister.

And to the present moment, the most effective argument which Rome offers in support of her imperious claims is exactly this. If you abandon me, you abandon Christianity. There is no *via media*. Either the Church is God's infallible minister or else there is no voice which can speak with authority upon the mysteries of human life. No other section of Christendom claims infallibility, and you cannot have authority without it. This is no imaginary picture. It is by this process of thought that in fact men are led at times to seek a refuge from intellectual perplexity in the subordination of their reason to this imperious and intolerant mistress. And the root of their mistake—the cause of their misfortune—is the confusion of authority with infallibility. They make the same blunder which the Pharisees of Jerusalem made, and the answer which we give them must still be the answer of St. Paul; “Do we then destroy the law? Nay we establish it.” We place the authority of the Church upon a firmer, because a truer, basis, when we admit that, like all other teachers, she may make mistakes.

For it is no principle of the Reformation to despise authority. No society of men, whether political or religious, can continue without the recognition of authority in some form. To put it on the lowest ground, the Church's authority in matters of doctrine is the authority which attaches itself to the formulated verdicts of the Christian consciousness reflecting devoutly on the revelation which

God has given us in Christ. To try to start afresh for ourselves, as if no one had ever heard of the gospel before us, is to throw away the garnered wisdom of the ages. It is to disregard the spiritual experience of the best and saintliest of our race for 1800 years. To pass by as of no interest for us or of no personal application, beliefs which may be truly described as Catholic, that is, as common to every part of Christendom at every time, would be presumptuous folly. The recognition of the Church's ministerial authority to frame her own laws is a dictate of common sense; and it is a dictate of modesty also to treat with respect the doctrinal statements which she has fashioned for herself out of the revelation which she has received, and by the aid of the Spirit which is ever guiding her into the truth. That she is God's authoritative minister to us we must certainly believe; but that she has been endowed with the gift of infallibility at any given moment of history is contradicted by the plainest facts.

But some one may say, "That is not the solution of the Reformation problem. The Reformers certainly rejected the infallible authority of the Church, but they did so because they went back to the infallible authority of the Bible. It was not the distinction between Infallibility and Authority on which they laid stress, but the distinction between the Church and the Bible. And the great service which the Reformers did was to recall men to this primitive fountain of truth, that they might drink of the water of life at its source, before it had been poisoned by the polluted streams which mingled with it in its fertilizing progress." There is a truth in this, and an important truth, but it is not the whole truth. Undoubtedly, there were those among the leaders of the Reformation who wished not only to break the yoke of the Papacy, but to cut themselves off from historical Christianity; there were those among them who scouted the idea of authority in any form, who went so far

as to belittle the Catholic creeds. They were the precursors of modern individualism in their dream that each man was intended by God to work out his creed from the Bible by himself, without human aid, paying no deference to the opinions of the past, yielding no respect to the experience of fifty generations of Christian life. Such individualism is not unknown even among ourselves. One need not stay to indicate its inconsistency with the teaching of St. Paul about the solidarity of mankind and the graces of the Church which is Christ's Body. But what is relevant here to observe is that such individualism was not the avowed principle of the English Reformation, whatever may have been true of Germany. It was not the principle of Cranmer, or Jewel, or Hooker, or Pearson, the masters of our Reformed theology. At the Reformation it was laid down (and which of us would gainsay it?) that ecclesiastical traditions are not of equal authority with what is revealed or recorded in the New Testament; it was urged that the ultimate appeal must be to Scripture as the test of doctrine. This was the Church's charter, and even the ancient creeds derive their binding force from their congruity with it. But it was also maintained that the Church is entrusted with the responsibility of teaching, and that her official teaching has for her members a higher authority than private speculation. She is not infallible—not infallible even in her interpretation of Scripture—but her authority is to be reckoned with, nevertheless. To think otherwise were to deny that she has any mission from above. Undoubtedly, the distinction of the idea of authority from the idea of infallibility is one of the fundamental tenets of the English Reformation.

This point of history has perhaps a useful application to our own perplexities. Once again the foundations of belief are being examined. More particularly is the problem as to the authority of the Bible being anxiously discussed.

And if we are alive to the lessons of the past, if we really wish to be faithful to the example of St. Paul, and to defend the teaching of the Reformation, there are three great principles which we must be ready to maintain.

(1) Traditions must not be allowed to usurp the place of the Bible. Traditions about the Bible itself must not be permitted to supersede its own witness. St. Paul refused to allow prophets of evil to frighten him from this position by their gloomy anticipations of consequence if the fence about the law were removed. It is not too much to say that some at least of the modern traditions about the Bible, to which many good people are sincerely attached, are so far from being corroborated by Scripture that they are contradicted by Scripture when closely examined. Let us go back to the Bible; but—let us remember—that is not necessarily to go back to what our forefathers with their lesser opportunities and fainter light believed about it. To do that may be to make void the word of God through our traditions.

(2) We must recognize that the authority of the Bible is a different conception from its infallibility. The authority of the Old Testament was not destroyed by St. Paul when he refused to submit to its precepts about circumcision; it was not destroyed by our Lord when He declared that its moral teaching was imperfect in certain particulars. Whatever conclusions may be reached about its inerrancy as to science or history (and in truth I do not know why we should suppose that it was meant to teach us either) its authority as a guide to Christ remains unshaken. To rest the authority of those sacred volumes on their absolute inerrancy in every passing historical note or scientific speculation is to incur the gravest kind of responsibility.

(3) And, thirdly, there is one form of authority which no man who has inherited the spirit of the Renaissance and the Reformation can think of discrediting, and that is the

authority of knowledge. Year by year the Church is learning better that she cannot dispense with that title to authority. The day is gone when controversies could be determined by a Bull of excommunication. But if the tyranny of Church Councils or Papal pronouncements is no longer to be feared, there is a danger in a democratic age of the tyranny of popular clamour or of ignorant prejudice. The leaders of the Reformation were the true sons of the Renaissance. They appealed to the verdict of history, to the court of learning; and their appeal won for us our priceless inheritance of orders and freedom. And we are false to the first principles of the Reformation if we appeal to any other court or submit to any other arbiters. There is an authority of ancient tradition—a grave and reverend authority—which we shall not discard lightly, although it be not equal to the authority of Scripture. Scripture has a supreme authority for us who believe it to contain a Divine message for man, although we may not be able to call it infallible in matters outside its sacred province. But we must not be afraid of letting in upon its dark places light from every quarter; and we must have welcome and not reproach, blessing and not cursing, for those who in the Name of Christ are trying to tell us more about it than we knew before. We shall test and try what they bring us; we shall compare it with the first principles of the Church's creeds as well as with the spiritual experience of the Church in every age. But we shall remember that "things true are not always things accustomed" and that loyalty to truth is—must be—loyalty to Christ whose servants we fain would be.

J. H. BERNARD.

THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF ST. PAUL.

(8) ASCETICISM TRUE AND FALSE.

THE history of asceticism fills a large chapter in the history of the Christian Church ; yet it is by no means a peculiarly Christian movement. Indeed, notwithstanding the real affinity between Christianity and the truth which underlies the exaggerations of asceticism, it may with good reason be argued that the movement is not really Christian at all, and that its place in Christian history is due rather to influences working from without than to the natural development of Christianity from within. However this may be, there is, of course, no doubt that, wholly apart from Christianity, ascetic ideals have exercised a strange and powerful fascination over the minds of men. Especially was this so in the East at the beginning of the Christian era, and it was therefore inevitable that, sooner or later, the preachers of the new faith would be called upon to define their gospel in relation to this strong and omnipresent rival. The claim of asceticism to be the guide of human life could not be avoided, and the Epistles of St. Paul show plainly that he at least had faced the issue. We shall, of course, look in vain, in writings so fragmentary and occasional in their character, for a discussion of the whole question ; yet, brief and few as the references to the subject are, they illustrate once more the splendid sanity which always marks the Apostle's handling of large and complex ethical problems.

As a preliminary to our exposition of St. Paul's teaching on the matter, it will be well clearly to understand in what sense the term "asceticism" is employed. As commonly used it covers a wide variety both of faith and practice, and unless this be kept in mind serious confusion may result. When, e.g., one Christian teacher tells us that asceticism is a misapprehension of the genius of Christianity, an

another that the Christian view of life is in the best sense of the word an ascetic view, they are evidently not thinking of the same thing. The truth is, asceticism is of two kinds. There is an asceticism which has its root in the necessities of sinful human nature; and this the New Testament honours and enjoins. There is also an asceticism for the origin of which we must look outside Christianity in the oriental idea of the antagonism between mind and matter; and to this the New Testament will give place, no, not for an hour. These, then, are the two branches of our subject: "the asceticism of dualism," which St. Paul condemns, and "the asceticism of self-discipline," which he enjoins.¹

I.

St. Paul's condemnation of asceticism is to be found in the Colossian and Pastoral Epistles. The following are the two most important passages:

"If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, do ye subject yourselves to ordinances? Handle not, nor taste, nor touch (all which things are to perish with the using), after the precepts and doctrines of men? Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and severity to the body; but are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh." (Col. ii. 20-23.)

"The Spirit saith expressly, that in later times some shall fall away from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies, branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by them that believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be rejected, if it

¹ The phrases are Lightfoot's. (*Colossians*, p. 105, footnote.)

be received with thanksgiving : for it is sanctified through the word of God and prayer " (1 Tim. iv. 1-5).¹

To enter into a discussion of all the important and debatable points raised by these two passages would carry us far beyond the limits of this paper. Following the guidance of Lightfoot, we shall assume without discussion that the heresy referred to in the Pastoral Epistles is practically the same as that which disturbed the Church at Colossæ, and that "incipient Gnosticism" describes with sufficient accuracy the nature of both. Oriental mysticism and Jewish ritualism had joined hands in the production of a religion of regulations which forbade marriage, and the eating of meat, and sought to govern the whole life of grown men by petty prohibitions : "Handle not, nor taste, nor touch." It is this practical result of the Gnostic creed rather than the creed itself which concerns us now. The Apostle's condemnation is almost startling in its severity : he smites and spares not : this false asceticism is the doctrine of devils ; they who proclaim it are liars and hypocrites. But St. Paul does more than denounce ; few as his words are, we shall find, if we examine them, that they go to the very root of the matter ; they indicate the grounds on which to-day, not less than in the first century, asceticism stands condemned. Putting together the two passages quoted above there are four counts in the Apostle's indictment.

1. To begin with, asceticism attaches a wholly unreal value to the meats and drinks about the use of which it has so much to say. All these things, the Apostle writes, with a touch of scorn, "are to perish with the using" : we use them, and there is an end of them ; and are we Christian men, whom God has called to be citizens of eternity, to put our necks under the yoke of a system whose supreme concern is about what we shall eat and what we shall drink ? Moreover, as all experience testifies, peddling

¹ See also Titus i 13-14.

casuistry of this kind usually ends in the perversion of the moral sense; over-concern in that which is least is next of kin to unconcern in that which is greatest; we tithe the herbs of the garden and neglect the weightier matters of the law.

2. In the Epistle to Timothy St. Paul adopts a different argument. Now he meets the apostles of asceticism on their own ground, and boldly declares that the things which they would set aside as unclean are the gifts of God which men ought gratefully to receive: "Every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be rejected, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified through the word of God and prayer." Need it be pointed out that even this great saying does not contain the whole philosophy of human life and that no man has a right to make it the charter of untrammelled licence? St. Paul says one thing at a time, and in using the large liberty which these words undoubtedly give us we have no right to forget the limitations which the Apostle himself elsewhere suggests. Nevertheless, the word needed to be spoken, and it still needs to be remembered. All God's gifts to men are good and for their thankful use; and though because some habitually misuse them others are sometimes compelled wholly to abstain from their use, yet this disuse is not a merit in itself; it is but a temporary expedient to meet a more or less temporary need. It is the fearful prevalence of drunkenness, e.g., which alone can make abstinence from wine a duty; in a nation wholly sober the demand to abstain might justly bring upon itself the rebuke of St. Paul: "Drink will not commend us to God: neither, if we drink, are we the worse: nor, if we drink not, are we the better." Temperance

¹ "This, to me," writes Charles Kingsley, "is the master truth of Christianity! I cannot make people see it, but it seems to me that it was to redeem man and the earth that Christ was made Man, and used the earth" (*Letters and Memories*, vol. i. p. 72).

reformers need to be on their guard lest through their bad advocacy of a good cause they let in by a side door the very foe which St. Paul strove to expel nineteen centuries ago.¹

3. The asceticism of dualism is not only philosophically false, it is practically useless: it is not, St. Paul declares, "of any value against the indulgence of the flesh."² Elsewhere (1 Tim iv. 8), he does indeed allow that "bodily exercise"—by which is meant not so much gymnastics, but physical asceticisms such as are referred to in the verses immediately preceding—"is profitable for a little"; but this slight concession leaves his general judgment unaltered, that tried by its results asceticism is a failure; it makes indeed a great "show of wisdom" in its "severity to the body," but it is powerless to subdue the lusts of the flesh. If it be thought that in so saying the Apostle errs on the side of extravagance, that such a rigorous handling of self as asceticism commends must at least do something to hold down the brute in man, it may be sufficient answer to point to the dark side of the history of monasticism. It should, however, be remembered that when St. Paul speaks of the "flesh," he means, "not merely the body, but the whole unregenerate personality, the entire unrenowned self that thinks, and feels, and wills, and desires, apart from God"³; and what his words declare is the powerlessness of any "ordinances" of men to keep down *that* self. Asceticism may, it is true, put an end to this or that sensual vice by removing the opportunity for its gratification, but it works

¹ The Apostle's advice to Timothy to "be no longer a drinker of water" (Tim. v. 23), was probably as much a protest against false asceticism of this kind as a counsel for the benefit of his health.

² I follow the rendering of the R.V.; it ought, however, to be said that it is sharply questioned by many competent scholars; see, e.g., A. S. Peake in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. iii. p. 535. Indeed the difficulties besetting every possible rendering are so great that Hort was led to suspect a primitive corruption of the text for which no probable emendation has been suggested.

³ Maclaren's *Epistle to the Colossians*, Expositor's Bible, *in loc.*

no real change ; the devil puts in a new viceroy, and some of the old officials get superannuated, but the government remains what it was ; uncleanness and drunkenness are dismissed, but pride and uncharitableness fill the vacant seats, and so the last state of the man is no better, and perhaps even worse, than the first.

(4) Finally, asceticism is in its spirit and its methods wholly alien to the genius of Christianity : “ If,” reasons St. Paul, “ ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world do ye subject yourselves to ordinances ? ” What have Christian men to do with an elaborate system of prohibitions which at best only touch the outside of life ? From the Christian point of view the whole thing is antiquated and superfluous ; it belongs to a state of things that is past, and for us to go back again to it would be as absurd as for a sixth-form boy to go back to the A.B.C. book of his infancy, or for a grown man voluntarily to submit himself to the petty restrictions of his childhood. Besides, what does such asceticism propose to do for us that cannot be better done by the Gospel of Jesus Christ ? Christianity works from within outwards ; it reforms by renewing ; it overcomes the world not by flight but by the gift of a new nature, against which the temptations of the flesh are powerless ; it makes men to be partakers of the life of Christ and so sharers with Him in His triumph over sin. “ Handle not, nor taste, nor touch,” says asceticism ; “ Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh,” says Christianity. Let history judge between them.

II.

Before passing to the second branch of the subject of this paper it may be instructive to inquire very briefly into the subsequent history of the ascetic movement in the Christian Church. St. Paul’s condemnation and warnings

notwithstanding, the tendencies which we have already seen at work, even in the days of New Testament Christianity, continued steadily to gain in strength and influence. Celibacy, abstinence of various kinds, retirement from the world, grew more and more in favour as marks of a special and peculiar sanctity, until, at the beginning of the fourth century, the ascetic spirit found in monasticism its most perfect expression. From that time forward, and throughout many centuries, the movement grew with the growth, and strengthened with the strength of Christianity itself. We have a curious and interesting illustration of the ascetic bias of the Church during this period in several references to fasting which found their way into some of the early copies of the New Testament and ultimately into our Authorised Version, but which our Revisers have rightly rejected.¹ Of the strange and hideous austerities by which the votaries of asceticism sought to outvie their fellow-saints and to commend themselves to their Maker, it is needless here to speak. The story may be read in all its repulsiveness in the pages of Gibbon or Lecky, or in the *St. Simeon Stylites* of Tennyson.²

How are we to explain this sudden and all but universal lapse of the Church from the sweet reasonableness and simplicity of its early life and faith? Anything more unlike the religion of Jesus and St. Paul than the grotesque extravagances of the "pillar-saints" of the fifth century it is difficult to conceive. What facts enable us to bridge

¹ The following are the texts referred to: Matt. xvii. 21; Mark ix. 29; Acts x. 30; 1. Cor. vii. 5. (See an article "Fasting in Holy Scripture," by Dean Farrar, *Expositor*, 4th series, vol. i. p. 339.)

² See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, chapter 37; Lecky's *History of European Morals*, vol. ii. Nor ought it to be said that the last chapter of this long and painful story has yet been written. Every age presents examples of the strange fascination which asceticism exercises over earnest minds of a certain type. The recital of Lacordaire's self-inflicted austerities—to take but one example—is one of the most harrowing and pitiful in modern biography. (See his life by Dora Greenwell.)

the seemingly impassable chasm? What first gave life to the ascetic movement was the undoubted truth which underlay all its perversions and which not even its later enormities ought to hide from us—the truth, viz., that only by rigid self-restraint can a being such as man is attain to fulness of life. The early ascetics saw, whatever else they may have failed to see, that in a world like ours the call of God must be a call to renunciation; they took with all seriousness the words of Jesus that if a man would be His disciple he must deny himself and take up his cross and follow Him. The bent thus given to their minds was strengthened enormously by the laxity and immorality of the early Christian era. When we remember that, as one writer has truly said, “the world has never been so ingeniously and so exhaustively wicked as in Rome during the first century,” it is no marvel that good men grew stern, and asked themselves if their first duty towards such a world was not to separate themselves wholly from it. Then, to reinforce such feelings, came the thought so long cherished of the early return of our Lord: what were home and pleasure and business when at any moment the Judge might be at the door?

*Hora novissima, tempora pessima sunt; vigilemus
Ecce minaciter, imminet arbiter, ille supremus—*¹

it must have been the cry of many hearts long before the lonely monk in the cloisters of Clugny poured out his deathless song. And, finally, a movement towards asceticism, eastern in its origin but well nigh world-wide in its reach, lent its treacherous aid from without, and in its doctrine of matter as the source and seat of evil furnished a quasi-philosophical justification of a manner of life for

¹ “The world is very evil;
The times are waxing late:
Be sober and keep vigil;
The Judge is at the gate.”

which already so many causes had united to prepare the way.¹

The ascetic movement has been very variously judged. To writers like Gibbon and Lecky it is a hideous scar, a long and blackened waste such as huge, invading armies once left in the line of their march. "A sordid and emaciated maniac," writes Lecky, "without knowledge, without patriotism, without natural affection, passing his life in a long routine of useless and atrocious self-torture, and quailing before the ghastly phantoms of his delirious brain, had become the ideal of the nations which had known the writings of Plato and Cicero and the lives of Socrates and Cato."² Other writers, however, like Dean Church, while admitting the repulsive details to which Mr. Lecky calls attention justly refuse to endorse a verdict which so inadequately recognizes the spirit and aim which "gave meaning and elevation to what was extravagant and disagreeable." The point cannot be better stated than in the Dean's own words: "When we remember what were the enormous, blind, intractable forces on the other side, in the days when it arose, of fierce, reckless, unrestrained sensuality, it seems as if nothing but such an enthusiasm, as inconsiderate and unmeasured, could balance or swing back, on a scale necessary for the progress of the world, the tremendous, ever-renewed and accumulating pressure in favour of self-indulgence. The severity of the early

¹ "The contest of Christianity with the Eastern religions," says Milman, "must be traced in their reaction upon the new religion of the West. By their treacherous alliance, they probably operated more extensively to the detriment of the Evangelic religion than Paganism by its open opposition. Asiatic influences have worked more completely into the body and essence of Christianity than any other foreign elements; and it is by no means improbable that tenets, which had their origin in India, have for many centuries predominated in, or materially affected, the Christianity of the whole Western world." (*History of Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 31.)

² *History of European Morals*, vol. ii. p. 107.

Church was a rebound and strong medicine against the ruinous dissoluteness of the decaying Empire, which no remedy but an heroic one seemed able to stay. . . . All these histories of monks, which lend themselves so easily to our sarcasms, and seem to us almost as disgusting as immorality itself, may be viewed in another way—as the crude, clumsy, distorted, absurd sketches of beginners, who yet have the heart and boldness to try to copy a great and difficult model. They are like the stiff, ungainly figures, drawn by the early masters, of the saints and hermits themselves, which in the hands of the later ones, come to forms of the highest nobleness and beauty. But the early steps must have been passed to reach the later perfection.”¹

Yet even Dean Church does not deny that the ascetic movement ended, as all such movements must end, in failure. It failed because it was rooted in a false philosophy ; it failed because it misunderstood both man and God. Healthy human nature protests against any doctrine which makes self-denial to be an end in itself, or pronounces misery more acceptable in God’s sight than happiness. Asceticism did both, and therefore, long and stubborn as its hold on life might be, it carried within it the seeds of its own decay. There is no need to deny that during its long career it may have served some useful end ; but it belongs now to the past, and it is difficult to believe that having once on the world’s scale been tried and found wanting, it can ever again find a place among the accredited allies of Christian morality.

III.

The “asceticism of dualism” stands condemned alike at

¹ *Occasional Papers*, vol. i. pp. 223-225. A defence of asceticism on somewhat similar lines may also be read in Strong’s *Christian Ethics*, p. 312 ; Illingworth’s *Christian Character*, p. 50 ; and Mr. Hugh Black’s *Culture and Restraint*. I very gladly take the opportunity of drawing attention to the full and lucid discussion of the whole problem contained in the last-named book.

the bar of scripture and of history. Has, then, the ascetic principle no place in the Christian scheme of life? And if so, what is the meaning of those calls to self-denial and cross-bearing which we hear so often from the lips both of our Lord and His Apostles? The answer lies in the distinction to which reference has already been made in the earlier part of this paper: there is a true as there is a false asceticism, and the New Testament insists on the one as plainly as it repudiates the other. We may construct a scheme of life from which all ideas of discipline, restraint, repression are excluded, but whatever noble elements it may contain it will have no right to the Christian name. The saying that not renunciation but consecration is the true ideal of life wears no doubt an attractive look; the anti-thesis is a false one, nevertheless; in a life like ours room must be found for consecration and renunciation alike.

It is here that the apostles of faith are sometimes compelled to join issue with the apostles of culture. When it is urged that self-renunciation is a species of self-maiming, and that the goal to perfection is to be reached by the path of self-development, it has to be pointed out that all such reasoning ignores the crucial fact of sin. If sin were not, then might culture have its perfect work, and lead man on to perfect life; but sin *is*, and that single fact changes entirely the whole aspect and character of the problem. "The self which we seek to develop is, here and now, a sinful self, and incapable, therefore, till its sin is overcome, of any true development at all."¹ All thought, therefore, of symmetrical completeness in our present life has to be set aside in face of the imperious necessity laid upon us by the presence of moral evil. Development still remains our goal, but stern experience teaches us that for beings such as we are it is attainable only by the way of discipline and rigorous self-control. In such self-control (*ἐγπάτεια*) St.

¹ Illingworth's *Christian Character*, p. 45.

Paul sees one of the fruits of the Spirit's indwelling life.¹ "Mortify your members which are upon the earth," he cries in the very Epistle in which he proclaims the vanity of a false asceticism: "fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, the which is idolatry."² "If by the spirit," he says again, "ye mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."³ "They that are of Christ Jesus," he declares, "have crucified the flesh with the passions and lusts thereof."⁴ And if there be any other commandment, it is summed up in the saying of Jesus, "If thy hand or thy foot causeth thee to stumble, cut it off, and cast it from thee: it is good for thee to enter into life maimed or halt, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into the eternal fire. And if thine eye causeth thee to stumble, pluck it out and cast it from thee: it is good for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into the hell of fire."

The meaning of all this is unmistakable. These New Testament phrases—self-denying, putting to death, crucifying, cutting off the right hand, plucking out the right eye, and the like—bear witness to the gravity of the problem which sin has created. They had their origin in

¹ Gal. 5, 23. *Ἐγπάρεια* covers, says Findlay, "the whole range of moral discipline, and concerns every sin and passion of our nature." The "temperate" man of the New Testament is he who not only abstains from excess in the use of strong drink—he does that, of course—but who holds himself well in hand, and keeps all the steeds that are yoked to the chariot of life well bridled and well bitted. The tongue, the hand, the foot, the eye, the temper, the tastes, the affections, all are made to feel the curb of his strong control.

² Col. iii. 5. Dr. Maclaren criticizes with justice the Revisers' translation of *νεκρώσατε*: "It is a pity," he says, "that the R.V. has retained "mortify" here, as that Latinized word says to the ordinary reader much less than is meant, and hides the allusion to the preceding context. The marginal alternative "make dead" is, to say the least, not idiomatic English. The suggestion of the American revisers, which is printed at the end of the R.V., "put to death," is much better, and perhaps a single word, such as "slay" or "kill," might have been better still."

³ Rom. viii. 13.

⁴ Gal. v. 24.

nothing morbid or unreal, but in a resolute facing of the facts of life. They do not deny nor discourage the desire for fulness of life ; they point out what for us men must be always the way to it. No modern apostle of culture ever yearned for perfection's heights with more eager longing than did St. Paul, but he never forgot that only "with toil of heart and knees and hands" can the "path upward" be won and the "toppling crags" be scaled.

The distinction between the asceticism which the New Testament commands and that which it condemns will now be clear. Christian asceticism is primarily prudential ; it is an expedient forced upon us by the necessities of our sinful state, good not for its own sake but only as a means to an end. "The morbid tendency that is sometimes found in human nature to take a voluptuous delight in pain" finds no encouragement in the New Testament ; self-inflicted pain can be justified only as the vinedresser's use of the pruning knife can be justified, that the vine "may bear more fruit." "I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage," says St. Paul, but with no hint of delight in such austerity for its own sake, only "lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected."¹ "If," said Jesus, "thy hand or thy foot causeth thee to stumble"—mark, *if* they do ; they may not ; it is not necessary that they should ; but if they do, then there is but one thing for it—"cut it off and cast it from thee." Christian asceticism, I repeat, is primarily prudential. "It springs from no underestimate of the goodness of God's creation, but simply from the recognition of man's tendency to sin, and consequent need for the avoidance of temptation. He cannot trust

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 27. Even in 1 Cor. vii., where it may be thought that the Apostle leans to the ascetic view of marriage, Stevens is, I think, right in his contention that it was a natural though mistaken eschatology, rather than any ascetic depreciation of marriage, which furnished the motive of his argument. (*Theology in the New Testament*, p. 419.)

himself, and so he must fly. But the man who feels this must be humbled by the feeling. Hence the Christian ascetic is as far removed as possible from all thought of accumulating merit by his austerities. They result expressly from his demerit, and are a perpetual reminder of its existence.”¹

GEORGE JACKSON.

ICONIUM.

THE object of this paper is to put together a picture of Iconium and its people in the first century after Christ. The attempt would be entirely vain, owing to the paucity of information, were it not for the intensity of municipal patriotism among the citizens of an ancient city. In modern times that character is not sufficiently remembered by many scholars, who are misled by the modern facts. The contrast between ancient and modern feeling is remarkable.

In most Scottish cities of the present day knowledge of, and interest in, their early history belong only to a few antiquaries: the mass of the citizens know and care nought about such matters. In Aberdeen the speaker in the Town Council, who wishes to persuade his audience, does not quote early history; if he were to begin a speech by appealing to his hearers' pride in “the Red Harlaw,” some would hardly know what he meant, others would regard him as an amiable enthusiast whose opinion about present business could be of no possible value. Patriotism is far from weak in the hearts of such citizens, though they are a little ashamed of manifesting it outwardly, and suspicious of, or amused by, those who show it more openly; but their patriotism is mainly for country and race.

But to the mind of the ancient Greek citizen his city

¹ Illingworth's *Christian Character*, p. 48.

absorbed all his patriotism. His city, not his country as a whole, was his "fatherland." He was keenly interested in its past, and he actively participated in managing its present government. A citizen who was not active and interested in his own State was disliked and contemned in general opinion; and the unwillingness of the early Christians to perform the religious acts required in all political duties, and their consequent abstention from them, intensified the disapproval which the pagan mob felt for them. The patriotism of the ordinary citizen gained intensity through the narrowness of its scope. All that his patriotism embraced was constantly present to his senses, and forced every day and every hour on his attention. He could not get away from its claims. It surrounded him from infancy, educated him in boyhood, and opened to him all his opportunities of activity in manhood. It was to a large extent co-extensive with, and inseparable from, his religion; in fact, the true Greek theory was that religion should be entirely co-extensive with patriotism; but human nature was too strong for theory, and it was impossible to restrict a man's religion within the circle of his duties towards the State, though the Greek view tended to regard as superstition all that lay outside of, and too deep for, that circle.

Only by an effort can the modern mind begin to appreciate how strong and real was the influence that the more striking facts of past history, and its half-religious, half-political legends, exerted on the ancient citizen. These were to him present and real influences, guiding his action and moulding his mind: they formed the standard according to which the orators and teachers, who wished to move the mind of the citizens, must accommodate their words; and each orator selected from past history, with such skill as he possessed, the points suitable for his own purposes. One single example will serve to show the enormous influence of historical legend on the ancient cities. It was

probably a Greek poet of Sicily who invented in the sixth century a connexion between ancient Greek history and the young city of Rome, already powerful under its kings ; for Greek views demanded that any strong external State should be brought into relations with old Greece. Thus arose the fancy that Rome was founded by Trojan refugees, fleeing from their city when Agamemnon captured and burned it. Yet this utterly groundless and non-Roman idea became gradually accepted by Rome herself ; it was used as an incident in the great national historical epics of Naevius and Ennius, and finally was made the plot of the most perfect literary expression of Roman sentiment and honour, the *Aeneid* of Virgil. It won its way to the Roman mind, though attributing a foreign origin and a fugitive ancestry to their people, mainly because it was a convenient political instrument. The ancient mind required, and always found or invented, a justification in past history and religion for all political action ; and, when the Romans began to exercise influence in the Greek world, they justified their interference by their right, guaranteed by old Greek authors, to carry on to completion the historical drama which had begun with the war of Troy and their own expulsion by the Greeks. On this ground they justified their interposition to protect their kindred in New Ilium against the Syrian king early in the third century (282 B.C.). Legend, half-religious, half-political, is here exhibited as a powerful and vital force in the ancient mind.

Iconian legends with regard to the foundation and past history of the city are, therefore, important as a means of understanding the mind of the people, who believed and circulated them. The example just given shows that the value of the evidence is entirely unconnected with historical truth. What the Iconians were saying at any time about their own past reveals what was their mind at that time,

about present matters, what they prided themselves on, what they claimed to be, what were the topics which might be appealed to by orators and teachers desirous of influencing their action. As at Rome, so at Iconium, totally different and inconsistent legends circulated with regard to their origin: these originated at different times, in different states of feeling, and among different constituent elements in the complicated fabric of their society and politics.

Our subject is Iconium and the Iconian people as they were in the early Christian centuries; but nothing which throws light on that period can be omitted safely; and old legend is our most useful guide. I may add that the criticism has been passed upon several of my studies in this department, especially the *Letters to the Seven Churches* and the *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, that they sometimes treated topics which had no real bearing on the parts of the New Testament that formed their professed subject. There is here involved a principle which is vital to our present purpose. What sort of people were they to whom those Epistles were written? For example, does the character of the Celtic Galatian tribes illustrate the Epistle, or are the "Galatians" the Greek-speaking citizens of certain Lycaonian and Phrygian cities of the Province? I write for those who wish to judge for themselves with sufficient knowledge, and not merely to take on credit the answer which I or others more competent may offer to such questions. So far as I can understand the situation of the Iconian people, I try to describe it, stating clearly the nature of the evidence.

I. NATURAL AND NATIONAL CHARACTER.

It would be difficult to find two cities more strikingly similar in general situation than Iconium and Damascus. Both lie on the level plateau, high above sea-level (Iconium

3,370, Damascus about 2,300 feet. Both are sheltered on the west by lofty mountains, or, as one might better say, a mountainous region : Anti-Lebanon in one case, the Phrygo-Pisidian mountain-land of the Orondeis in the other, each with peaks of more than 6,000 feet in height, rise from the level plain two or three miles west of the city. From the mountains, in each case, flows down a stream right into the city, making the land around into a great garden, green with trees, rich in produce ; but the water has no outlet, and is soon dissipated in the soil of the level plains which stretch away to the east of both cities, as far as the eye can see. Yet the scenery to the east is not monotonous in the outlook, for mountains rising here and there like islands give character and variety to the view.

Iconium and Damascus alike are unfit for defence, and utterly devoid of military strength according to ancient methods of warfare. They are cities of peace, centres of commerce, and agriculture, and wealth, marked out by their natural character for historical and political importance throughout all time. Water is scarce on those arid plateaus, and sites which had an abundant, ever-flowing, natural supply of water, formed centres of human life and history from the beginning of organized society. Their importance, therefore, rested on a sure foundation. No political change could destroy them, though oppressive or inefficient government might temporarily diminish their wealth and prosperity.

Damascus has filled a greater place before the eyes of the world than Iconium ; it stands pre-eminent in historical and romantic interest, because it was closer to the scene of the greatest events and peoples of history. In fame it surpasses Iconium as much as its river Abana surpasses in the volume of water that it carries the stream which gives fertility and growth to the gardens of Iconium. Iconium was at least as important in relation to its neighbouring

towns and tribes as Damascus ; but Damascus lay closer to the main centres of historic evolution, while we can only dimly conjecture that Asia Minor was more important in the world's history before 1500 B.C. than it has been since, and in that early period Iconium is to us only a name and a legend.

Only at one period in later history has Iconium rivalled the political importance as a governing city that has several times belonged to Damascus. In the Seljuk period, from the end of the eleventh century to the fourteenth, Iconium or Konia was the capital of the Seljuk empire of Roum. The Sultans of Konia waged war on equal terms with the Emperors of Constantinople ; they held great part of Asia Minor, and for a time Nicaea itself was one of their garrison cities, while their armies swept in repeated raids down to the Aegean Sea. The city was then made so splendid with beautiful buildings, palace, mosques, and mausolea, that the proverb arose and lasted long among the Turks, " See all the world ; but see Konia."

Both Iconium and Damascus are, therefore, necessarily and inevitably of immemorial antiquity. However far back in history one can penetrate, there one finds standing out clearly in the dimness of primitive history or legend the importance of those two great cities. Damascus has always been famous as the oldest city in the world. But Iconium, though less famous, was as old as Damascus, for both went back to the beginning of history. At Iconium tradition recorded the fame of King Nannakos (or Annakos), who reigned before the Flood, and lived to the age of 300 years. Learning from an oracle that, when he died, all men should perish, he convoked all people to the temple, and " made supplication with tears," and his Phrygian subjects mourned so vehemently that " the weeping in the time of Nannakos " became a proverb even among the Greeks. Herondas of Cos about 270 B.C. makes one of his characters, speaking

in the common conversational language of lower middle-class society in a Greek town, quote this proverb.

Soon after "the weeping of Nannakos" came the Flood in which all men perished. When the earth dried again after the flood, Jupiter bade Prometheus and Athena make images (*eikones*) of mud, and he caused the winds to breathe on the images, and they became living. Thus Iconium was re-peopled immediately after the Flood, and derived its name from the *eikones*. The last is a Greek addition; in the Phrygian legend evidently the city bore before the flood the same name as after.

Nannakos gave origin to other proverbs. "More ancient than Nannakos," "from Nannakos," "in the time of Nannakos," and similar phrases were widely used to describe things of great age, and survivals of primitive antiquity.

Attempts have been made to show that the story of Nannakos was borrowed from Jewish tradition and record, and was not a native Iconian legend.¹ It is assumed in such attempts that the form Annakos gives the original and correct name, and that it is the Biblical Hanokh, or Enoch; the Flood which destroyed the Phrygian world at the death of Annakos is explained as a version of the narrative given in Genesis vi.-ix. But this theory cannot be accepted. The correct name is certainly Nannakos, which appears in all authorities except Stephanus (in whose text Annakos is probably a mere error); Nannakos is a name known in Asia Minor, and the cognate names, Nannas, Nannasos, etc., are common in the country round Iconium. The frequent and varied forms of proverb connected with the name furnish strong proof that the legend was one of native origin, and not borrowed from the Bible. The only way in which a Biblical origin could be explained is through the influence of the Jewish colonists in Lycaonia and Phrygia; but these colonies belong to the Seleucid

¹ Especially by M. Babelon, *Mélanges Numismatiques*, I. 1892, p. 171.

times ; they began under Seleucus Nicator shortly before 281 ; but it is unlikely that they could ever have acquired such deep-rooted importance as to influence popular expression in the degree which those proverbs imply, and certainly they could not do so before the great foundations made by Antiochus the Great, about 215-200 B.C.¹ The Jews of Phrygia were undoubtedly wealthy, influential, and energetic, and they strongly affected the religious ideas of thoughtful men, as the writer has tried to describe elsewhere² ; but their influence was not of the kind that was likely to mould popular language ; rather they were hated and feared by the vulgar. Moreover, it was rather in the Roman than in the Greek period that they became so influential. Now the proverbial use of the story of Nannakos was firmly rooted on the west coast of Asia Minor when Herondas was writing about 270-260 B.C., and it seems impossible to account for this except through the influence of an ancient Phrygian tradition familiarly known to the Greeks from a very early time.

The story of Nannakos, then, although only a fragment of it has been preserved, belongs to native Iconian tradition, and furnishes evidence of a primitive Phrygian belief in a Deluge ; though it may be freely admitted that the story, as told by Suidas, has probably been coloured by the Biblical narrative, which indubitably affected Phrygian legends in later time.

The precise form of the Iconian legend is irrecoverable, but it was evidently markedly different from the Biblical form. The coming of some disaster was predicted to the people, and their vehement mourning over the impending catastrophe was the feature that most deeply impressed the Greek mind. Their king, Nannakos, in spite of his tearful supplications, by which evidently he tried to propitiate the god and avert the Deluge, seems to have perished with his

¹ *Letters to the Seven Churches*, chaps. xi. xii.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 145, 149.

people, and the land was repopled by Divine intervention.

The primitive Phrygian legend can be traced also at Apameia-Celaenae in a non-Biblical form.¹ It was there connected with the remarkable natural phenomena of the locality, the underground waters, and it took the form that Divine intervention saved the city from being entirely engulfed, after many had perished. This native legend at Celaenae (of which the details are not preserved) was modified by contamination with the Biblical story, as appears on the coins with the name and type of Noah and the Ark; but there is no reason to think that this occurred until the Roman period; the Noah coins are of the third century after Christ. Here also the Jewish influence was slow and late in affecting popular thought, and the analogy constitutes an additional argument that Nannakos could not be borrowed from Jewish sources. In both cases the earlier allusions reveal a legend unlike the Biblical form, and the Biblical analogies are stronger in the later references.

It seems probable that the Iconian form of the legend was, like the Apamean, adapted to local circumstances. Further exploration is needed to give certainty, but there is every probability that the plain of Iconium was irrigated by water brought from the large lake, Trogitis, about forty-five miles in an air line to the south-west, separated from Iconium by the high Orondian mountain country. The evidence for this must be stated here.

A scheme has been under consideration recently for bringing the water of this lake to irrigate the plain. In 1882 the writer heard Sayyid Pasha, governor of the Konia Vilayet,² speak of the plan and the surveys which he had caused to be made in preparation for it; and the scheme

¹ This paragraph gives in brief the results of the discussion in *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, ii. pp. 415, 432, 671.

² The great province, whose capital is Konia, the ancient Iconium.

has been revived in the last few years as a private enterprise to be carried out by a European company. It is stated on good authority that the engineers, who reported on the practicability of the scheme, found that it could be carried out at very slight expenditure, because an ancient cutting,¹ which had formerly carried the water through the mountains at the only difficult point, still exists, and can readily be cleared again. That a channel exists by which the water of lake Trogitis can flow into the Konia plain, has long been known to the archaeological travellers in Lycaonia, but I had been under the impression that it was a purely natural channel, discharging into the river Tcharshamba, which flows across the plain of Konia, about 24 miles south of the city. This river is described by the Arab geographer Ibn Khardodhbeh in the ninth century under the name of Nahr-el-Ahsa, River of Subterranean Waters,² and the name seems to prove that the connexion with the lake was still open at that time. In more recent time the channel has been allowed to become blocked up, and the connexion with the lake has ceased, except when the water of Trogitis (which varies greatly in volume) is very high. Professor Sterrett, in the account of his exploration of this district,³ reports that the water was flowing from the lake through the channel in 1885, but he unfortunately did not follow its course. In May 1905 the river was carrying a large body of water into the plain of Konia, but I was assured that no connexion with the lake was open, and that the water came entirely from the Isaurian mountains.

Hearing at Konia, in May 1905, the report about the ancient cutting, I perceived at once that if such a great

¹ Another ancient cutting in a different part of those mountains, is described in Professor Sterrett's *Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor*, p. 161.

² For this identification of Nahr-el-Ahsa, see the writer's "Lycaonia" in the *Jahreshefte des k. k. Oest. Arch. Instituts*, 1904, p. 118 (Beiblatt).

³ *The Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor*, pp. 124, 133, 180.

engineering work existed, it must have affected Iconian legend; and, being hopeful also of finding evidence of the period when it was executed, I went to investigate; but after two days, it became evident that more time than was at my disposal would be necessary, and I had to abandon the quest. But, whether the channel was wholly natural or in part artificial, there can be little doubt that in ancient times the course of the water was kept clear, and that the plain of Iconium was dependent for its fertility on this water supply. Strabo contrasts the fertility of the Iconian plain with the barrenness of northern and eastern Lycaonia; and the reason for the difference lies in the water supply. Those Lycaonian plains are, as a rule, entirely fertile in soil, but the productiveness depends on the supply of water by human agency.

We conclude, then, that a religious myth was attached to the irrigation of the Iconian plain. It was through Divine helping power that the water was not a destructive deluge, as it once had been.¹ The gods themselves saved the land and the people whom they had made, moderating an ever-present danger of flood into a beneficent irrigation. Similar legends are found wherever in Asia Minor any remarkable water-supply exists, as at Apameia-Celaenae or in the valley of Colossae.²

The form which the Deluge-story took at Iconium is adapted to bring into strong relief the great antiquity of the city. The Iconians prided themselves on their ancient origin: their city was the first founded after the Flood, and it had been great before the Flood; the belief that Phrygian was the Primitive language of mankind—a belief which was proved to be true by a scientific experiment conducted on

¹ It is so still at the present day, when the inundation waters of this river sometimes cover a large tract of the Iconian plain.

² On Colossae and its waters see *The Church in the Roman Empire*, last chapter.

the order of the Egyptian king Psammetichus, who found that infants brought up out of hearing of human speech spoke the Phrygian language—was probably shared by them. It was evidently through this pride in their antiquity that they preserved the tradition of their Phrygian origin. Most of those Hellenized cities of Asia Minor claimed to have a Greek origin, and invented legends to connect themselves with Greek history and mythology. In this legend the Iconians claimed to be pre-Greek, the ancient city, the beginning of history.

There was, however, another Iconian legend, which attributed a Greek origin to the city. It is recorded in such confused and self-contradictory fashion by late Byzantine authorities (the Paschal Chronicle, Cedrenus, and Malalas) that one would be tempted to set it aside as mere scholastic trifling, if it were not proved by the Iconian coins to be the accepted legend in the city during the Greek and the Roman period. The Nannakos legend throws no light on, and receives none from, the coinage of the city; but the tale told so badly in the Paschal Chronicle, Malalas, and Cedrenus, stands in the closest relation to the coins, which form the surest indication of the current views in Iconium.

We shall, for brevity's sake, relate this Greek legend only in the form that best suits the coinage, tacitly omitting all the variations that are mixed up in the three versions. Perseus came to Lycaonia, and vanquished the opposition of the people by the power of the Gorgoneion, which turned his enemies to stone. He then made a village called Amandra into a Greek city, and called it Iconium from the image or *eikon* of the Gorgon, which he received there before the victory. This seems to point to Divine help received by him before the battle began. He erected in front of the new city a statue representing himself holding up the Gorgon's head; and this statue (the authorities say)

is standing there to the present day. The coins show us the same statue, which was doubtless an ornament of the city; there can be little doubt that it was a Hellenistic work modelled after the famous statue of Perseus by the great Attic sculptor of the fifth century B.C., Myron.

Now it must be asked how there could be two legends in the city about its origin, a Phrygian and a Greek. What is the relation between the two? The analogy of many other cases leaves practically no doubt that the two legends belong to different sections of the population; one belongs to the Hellenized and educated section, partly Greek immigrants but chiefly Grecized natives, and the other to the humbler, uneducated native Phrygian population. This becomes clear also if we glance at the religion of Iconium.

The religion of an ancient city was the most complete expression of its spirit and ideals and aspirations, and a full knowledge of its religion would be an epitome of the evolution of its social organisation. About the religion of Iconium little information has been preserved. To judge from the evidence of inscriptions, the deity whose worship was most deeply rooted in the popular mind was a form of the Phrygian Mother-Goddess, Cybele. She was known as the Zizimmene Mother in all this region from Iconium northwards to a distance of sixteen hours. The name is derived from her chosen home at Zizima among the mountains, about five hours north of Iconium, where she had revealed her presence by the underground wealth which she taught men how to recover. The quicksilver mines beside the village (which still bears the old name under the form Sizma) have been worked from a remote period, as is proved by the extensive old shafts, and are still productive. The underworld, with its wealth as seen in mines, and its marvellous powers seen in the hot springs and medicinal waters and cool refreshing fountains, which it tenders for the use of man, was the abode of the Divine

nature, and the ultimate home from which man comes and to which he returns in death. This thought was strong in the Phrygian mind, and the serpent which lives in the earth was regarded with awe as the intermediary between the Divine power and mankind, and as the bearer of the healing and kindly influence of the Divine nature. Wherever signs of the wealth and power under the earth were most clearly manifested, there the Goddess Mother had her seat, and she assumed a certain local character according to the nature of the place and the people, though the same fundamental Divine conception underlay each of these local forms. Thus Zizima was marked out as the home of the great deity of south-eastern Phrygia. In Iconium she was styled also the Mother Boëthene and Mother of the Gods: the former title is apparently some old local epithet, Grecized in form, so as to suggest the meaning "the Mother who comes to help."

But this native Phrygian conception of the Divine nature has left little mark on the coins of Iconium. Only faint traces of the worship of the Phrygian goddess appear on them. Athena is the important divine type: she appears in many variations, but the most characteristic represents her standing, holding in her left hand an upright spear, on which she leans and round which twines a serpent. The serpent marks her character as the health-giving deity, and the Iconian Athena may be regarded as a Hellenized form of the Phrygian goddess. Zeus and Perseus, whom she aided and directed in his travels and his conquest, are the other important types, and purely Greek.

The bearing of these facts seems clear. Athena with her associated hero Perseus represents the immigrant Greek influence, which became completely dominant in the city, and for a time seemed to have almost expelled the Phrygian religion from the public ceremonial, as Perseus routed and benumbed the natives of the land. But this

was only in outward show. The Iconian Athena was a strongly Hellenized form of the Phrygian goddess, but the common people never lost their hold on their own Mother-Goddess. This external character as a Greek city belonged to Iconium from the time when its coinage began, probably about 100 B.C. The educated classes and the representative citizens counted themselves as Hellenes, not as Phrygians. The hero of the immigrant Greek civilization had destroyed the Phrygian character and transformed an oriental town into a Greek self-governing city. It is highly probable that this hero also is a Grecized transformation of a native hero, whose image is preserved to us in a drawing published by Texier. The stele from which it was taken was destroyed by a Turkish workman soon after 1880, as I was informed by Mr. A. Keun, formerly British Consul in Konia, who attempted vainly to have it protected.

Thus the ancient Phrygian origin and the new Hellenism of Iconium stand out clearly in the foundation legends. About the time of Christ it was a Greek city, proud at once of its ancient pre-Hellenic origin at the very beginning of history, and of its transformed and thoroughly Hellenic character. Its free, self-governing constitution is marked by the magistrate's name, which appears on some of its early coins, Menedemos son of Timotheos. Everything here is Greek. The Phrygian was quite Oriental in character, a slave of government, submitting to the rule of a king or of the god through his priest: the Greek was a free citizen, master of his own life, joining by vote and lively interest in the administration of his own city, his fatherland.

But the national character was not eradicated. Hellenism was here only a superficial stratum. The deep-lying character gradually re-emerged. The revival of the national Anatolian character after the first century of our era is a

general and striking feature in Asia Minor. The Hellenistic character grows weaker and the Oriental stronger; or perhaps it would be more correct to say that a new and mixed type was developed, in which Oriental, Greek, and Roman characteristics were all blended. One Iconian coin, 70-79 A.D., shows the Phrygian goddess, Cybele, seated, holding a bowl or patera in her right hand; but the barbaric element that commonly accompanies this type, the pair of lions, is wanting. Even Cybele is Hellenized here.

The name of the city reflects its character. The old name was never abandoned: Iconium held too firmly to its glory as the oldest of cities to give up the name that marked its origin. Similarly in Lydia the ancient capital Sardis never abandoned its name and its Lydian primeval fame; but Philadelphia, a Grecized refoundation of an old Lydian town, changed its name to Neocaesareia (though this did not last long), and Hierapolis permanently assumed the name Hiero-Caesareia. Sardis indeed added an epithet to mark its Roman character and its favour with the Emperor Tiberius, and styled itself "Caesarian Sardis"; and for the same reason Iconium styled itself "Claudian Iconium." In both cases the epithet lasted for a time, and gradually passed out of use. But such epithets indicate the tenacious clinging to the character of the Greek constitutional state: Sardis or Iconium was still a Greek city qualified by a Roman honorary appellation, a Greek constitution modified by Roman admixture. The new title was assumed between 44 and 56 A.D., probably in or soon after 44.

Here I find myself compelled to dissent from what seems to be the accepted view in Germany, and we must therefore consider the facts more carefully.

II. THE ROMAN COLONY ICONIUM.

The evidence is so conclusive as to the foundation of

this Colony by Hadrian that it formerly appeared sufficient to mention in passing the inaccuracy into which many writers have fallen, when they say that Claudius founded a Roman Colony at Iconium. It was not that I wished to treat their opinion disrespectfully: on the contrary, I thought that the most respectful way was to treat it as a mere slip, due to insufficient consideration about a small detail, and to relegate the matter to a footnote, or the corner of a sentence. But the mistake has been repeated by Professor Zahn in his *Einleitung in das N.T.*, 1877, § 11, n. 5, and expressly championed by him in contradiction of my correction in his *Kommentar zum N.T. : Galater* 1905, p. 13. The great influence which his work and opinion deservedly carry in the world of scholars, and my profound respect for his learning, make it now necessary to state the reasons on which I ventured to correct him and others. Moreover, the same error is made in the two principal German handbooks, to which everyone turns for information about the constitution of the Roman Provinces; Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. p. 364 (ed. ii., 1881); and Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie d. Class. Alt.* iv. 551, 1900 (the author is Prof. Kornemann, whose authority is first rate); and many writers on Acts and Galatians repeat the same statement.¹ It seems that every step in the Galatian controversy must be won by a pitched battle; and that even a point like this, where there is not the shadow of evidence on one side and absolutely conclusive reasons on the other, has to be fought for before the truth can prevail. My desire has been to avoid long disquisitions on such points; but the Biblical scholars will not abandon any view until the arguments have been set forth at full length.

In the way of evidence Professor Zahn adduces really nothing. (1) He quotes, indeed, an inscription in which the

¹ Dr. Knowling, in his Commentary, corrects the common error.

Iconian Demos honours an Imperial Procurator as its "Benefactor and Founder." But Iconium is here clearly marked as a Greek city (πόλις), governed by the Greek assembly of the Demos, and not as a Colonia.¹ Moreover, the official act of a Colonia at that period would be expressed in Latin, not in Greek. This document, so far from showing that Iconium was a Colonia, furnishes conclusive proof that Claudiconium was not a Colonia when the inscription was erected in the beginning of Nero's reign. Iconium received its new title from Claudius, but was not made a Colonia by him.

(2) It is also asserted that, as this Procurator was honoured as "Founder" by the Demos of Iconium, he must have been the Founder of the Colonia Iconium; but (a) as this document shows that Iconium was not a Colonia, the Procurator cannot have founded the Colonia; (b) if Iconium had been a Colonia, it would not have been founded by a Procurator; (c) the title "Founder" was applied in lavish fashion by the Greek cities of Asia Minor and Greece proper; and little can be inferred from it.

(3) No colonial coin of Iconium is known before Hadrian. Claudiconium struck coins as a Greek city under Claudius, Nero, Vespasianus, Titus, and Hadrian. Then under Hadrian (evidently near the end of the reign, to judge from their rarity) the colonial coins begin, and continue under succeeding Emperors. No coins of the Greek city are later than Hadrian. This, even alone, would be conclusive.

(4) It is also said that Iconium as a Colonia was called Claudia Iconium. This is not correct; the title Claudia Iconium never occurs: it is an invention of Marquardt's. The fact is, that, when Iconium became a Colonia, it abandoned the title Claudiconium, which hardly occurs except in Greek, and took the name Colonia Aelia Hadriana

¹ When such an honorary inscription is erected by a Colony, it is the Colonia (i.e. body of *coloni*) that is mentioned, not the Dêmos. Compare e.g., Sterrett, *Wolfe Expedition* No. 352, and C.I.L. iii. 6786.

Augusta Iconiensium (or Iconensium) : the series of coins furnishes the proof that the Greek name *Klaudeikonion* lasted until the colony was founded, and then gave place to the simple *Iconium*. Inscriptions, as a rule, are in agreement, though (1) they cannot be so exactly dated as to furnish a proof of the rule ; (2) they are not so accurate (especially when private documents) in observing strict nomenclature as coins.¹

These facts are as convincing and conclusive as it is possible for reasons about ancient history to be. They have all been public property for many years, and have convinced the numismatists,² who are more accurate about questions of this kind than the historians and the Biblical scholars, and more accurate even than many of the epigraphists. But I will add another proof so decisive that nothing more conclusive can be possibly imagined. In May, 1905, I copied in *Iconium* an inscription recording the career and honours³ of the first supreme magistrate of the *Colonia* (*duumviro primo Coloniae*).⁴ His name was M. Ulpus Pomponius Superstes, and he was son of M. Ulpus Valens. The names are sufficient proof of the date. It must have been some time after A.D. 130, before the son of a man

¹ I thought at first that I had seen an inscription with the name *Claudiconium* used of the *Colonia* ; but on examination cannot find that there is any. A Greek epitaph of a Colonial magistrate [*δυναρχικός*] *Ελκονίου* is published by Professor Sterrett, *Epigraphic Journey*, No. 254 (I quote it from my own copy in 1901) ; but his name proves that he is later than Hadrian.

² See e.g. Hill in *Brit. Mus. Catalogue of Coins : Lycaonia*, p. xxiv. ; Imhoof Blumer, *Kleinasiatische Münzen*, ii. p. 418.

³ Possibly his epitaph, but more probably engraved on the pedestal of a small statue in his honour.

⁴ The inscription (which I sent to Dr. Wiegand, of the German Institute in Constantinople, through my friend the German Consul in Konia, Dr. Loytved) contains many points of interest. To make assurance doubly sure I consulted also my friend Professor O. Hirschfeld, in Berlin, the leading authority on Latin Epigraphy, who considers the meaning of the phrase quoted to be indubitable.

named M. Ulpus could be of legal age to be appointed duumvir of a Roman colony. Evidently the father received the Roman citizenship under Trajan, 98-117 A.D., and took his Roman name, M. Ulpus, from the Emperor. The name was inherited by his son, who, as a leading Roman of Iconium, was appointed one of the two chief magistrates in the year that the Colonia was founded, not long before 138 A.D.

The course of events preceding the foundation of the Colonia was probably as follows: Hadrian, during his second eastern journey, A.D. 130, formed the plan of reorganizing south-eastern Asia Minor. He saw that the older principle of provincial division, on which Asia and Galatia especially had been formed—disregarding national divisions, breaking up one nation among two provinces, and uniting many nations in one province, with the apparent intention of trampling on national patriotism as non-Roman, and substituting the Roman unity, Asia or Galatia Provincia, for the national unity—he saw that this principle had failed, and that national feelings were gradually reviving. He was not prepared to reorganize the eastern world; but he made some changes in the direction of paying more respect to national distinctions and feelings. About the last year of his reign he instituted the new Province of the Three Eparchiae, Cilicia-Isauria-Lycaonia. As its name and organization show, these Eparchies were to be really three Provinces conjoined under a single head, each retaining its individuality. Thus there was a separate Koinon or provincial Council of the Lycaonians, and no common Council of the three Eparchies.

Iconium was not included in this new Eparchia Lycaonia. It remained part of the Province Galatia; but its growing importance was recognized by making it a Colonia. This refoundation no longer involved the introduction of a body of Roman colonists, as it had done in the Republican and

the early Imperial time. It was a sort of political fiction, and meant only the raising of Iconium to the highest class of cities, enjoying the fullest privileges and rights permitted in the Roman Provinces.¹ This dignity was conferred on Iconium between 130 and 138, probably near the later date.

So lively a sense of the honour was felt at Iconium that the government forthwith began to act as a Roman city. They abandoned the use of Greek and employed only Latin in official documents, i.e., coins and inscriptions (and doubtless also in documents written on more perishable materials, like paper, though these have all perished, and positive certainty is therefore not attainable). This remarkable fact shows how real the distinction was between a Greek and a Roman city, and how much, as regards the pride of Iconium and its patriotism and sense of dignity, was involved in the question whether it was a Greek city or a Roman Colonia in the time of St. Paul. The account which is given of Iconium in my *Church in the Roman Empire*,² and in *St. Paul the Traveller* would be fundamentally inaccurate, if it had been a colony founded by Claudius.

The people, of course, could not change their language so easily as the municipality could. They continued to speak Greek and to write in Greek. The epitaphs, with the rarest exceptions, are Greek after 138 A.D., as they were before. In this respect Iconium offers a strong contrast to Pisidian Antioch (where the epithets were for the most part Latin throughout the first two centuries of the Empire), and even to Lystra, where Latin epitaphs are quite as

¹ Kornemann in art. *Coloniae*, Pauly-Wissowa, iv. p. 566.

² It is called "a Roman City," p. 45 note; but this phrase means only, as the context shows, a city of the Empire and of the Province Galatia (in contrast to Dr. Farrar's statement that it was excluded from the Province).

numerous as Greek, the Greek epitaphs being later and the Latin older.

But the Roman city or *Colonia Iconiensis* formed a new ideal for itself. The Phrygian feeling (as we have seen) was reviving. Iconium now felt itself to be an old Phrygian city which had become a Roman *Colonia*. The statue of Marsyas, the mark and pledge of Roman rights and liberty, was erected in the Iconian forum, and represented as a type on its coins. The other usual Colonial types, the ploughing *Colonus*, the she-wolf with the twins (a copy of which was probably placed in the forum), blazoned the Roman character of *Colonia Iconiensis*.

Yet the Greek character was not expelled, and could not be expelled, for Iconium had been too strongly affected by Greek education and feeling; it was still a Greek-speaking city (except perhaps among the humbler classes, where the Phrygian language may have still lingered), and so far as it contained works of art, they were Greek works. The coins reflect this side of the city's life, when they occasionally employ Perseus as a type, or show us the three Graces (probably taken from a group of statuary in one of the public places or halls). Athena, too, continued to be the chief Divine type, and not any Roman god. The Emperors were the sufficient envisagement of Roman divinity.

It was only the native Phrygian character that found no admission on the coins, in spite of its growing strength among the people. It remained always inarticulate, strongest among the uneducated, living in the popular heart. We can only dimly trace it on the lips of the people, as when the Iconian Hierax, a slave in Rome condemned as a Christian in 163 A.D., informed the Prefect who was trying the case that he had come from Iconium of Phrygia; or when Bishop Firmilian mentions that the Council of 232 A.D. was held at Iconium in Phrygia (doubt-

less repeating the description which he had heard in the city, when he attended the Council). Iconium was now no longer a part of Lycaonia in a political sense; and the connexion of blood, and in some degree perhaps of language, with Phrygia was felt more strongly.

W. M. RAMSAY.

SENNACHERIB AND JERUSALEM.

705-681 B.C.

A PREVIOUS paper¹ brought the history of Isaiah's Jerusalem to the eve of its great crisis: the campaign, or, as we may find probable, the *two* campaigns of Sennacherib against Southern Palestine.

I.

Sargon died in 705, and, as usual, the transfer of the Assyrian throne became the occasion for a general revolt among its vassals. The most formidable was Merodach Baladan, of Bīt Jakīn, on the northern coast of the Persian Gulf, who in 709 had been driven from Babylon by Sargon, and now regained that great capital with all the commercial and religious influence which its possession conferred. He enjoyed besides the support of Elam. In 703 Sennacherib, on his first campaign, drove Merodach Baladan out of Babylon, and set up there, as "king of Sumer and Akkad," a vassal of his own, named Bel Ibni. Sennacherib's second campaign in 702 was northwards, towards Media; and in 701 he began his third—against Phoenicia and Palestine.²

¹ EXPOSITOR for July.

² There are six Assyrian accounts of, or references to, this campaign (1) "The Rassam Cylinder" of 700 B.C., recording Sennacherib's first three campaigns. (2) "The Taylor Cylinder" of 691 (in the British Museum, reproduced at p. 188 of *Light from the East*, by Rev. C. S. Ball, London, 1899), recording eight campaigns, the account of the first three based on "The Rassam Cylinder." (3) "The Bull Inscription" (on slab I. of the Kuyunjik Bulls in the British Museum, translated in *Records of the Past*, vii. 57 ff., by Rodwell). (4) Cylinder C. (5) The Neby Yunus

His swift overthrow of the Phoenicians terrified a number of the southern states into submission, but Judah, Ashkelon, Ekron—where the Assyrian vassal, Padi, had been deposed,—and others continued to resist. The head of this coalition was Hezekiah, by virtue alike of the size of his territory, the strength of his capital, and the repute of his arms, which had recently overrun Philistia as far as Gaza.¹ Padi, upon his deposition—which, perhaps, occurred on this campaign—was delivered into the keeping of Hezekiah. As we have seen,² the league against Assyria did not rely solely upon its own forces. Sennacherib tells us that Hezekiah had increased the garrison of Jerusalem by a number of Arab mercenaries,³ and among the forces he encountered at Eltēkeh, near Ekron, were “bowmen, chariots, and horses of the king of Melukhkha,” which used to be considered as Ethiopia, but is now by Assyriologists held to be a state or territory of Northern Arabia.⁴

Inscription of Sennacherib (now at Constantinople; translated in *Records of the Past*, xi. 45 ff., by Budge), with a very brief notice of the campaign of 701, lines 13–15. (6) The Bas-Relief from Sennacherib's Palace at Nineveh (now in the British Museum; reproduced in *Light from the East*, 190 ff.), with the inscription, “Sennacherib, king of the world, king of Assyria, sate on a throne and caused the spoil of Lachish to pass before him.” Of all these the most useful to the historian of Hezekiah's reign is “The Taylor Cylinder,” along with the additional information of the Bas-Relief of the Siege of Lachish. For the following pages I have used the various translations, or summaries, of “The Taylor Cylinder,” by Talbot, Schrader, Sayce, Ball, Winckler, Weber, Price, and Rogers.

¹ 2 Kings xviii. 8. Professor Cheyne (*E. B.* column 3059) seems to me rightly to date this campaign of Hezekiah *before* Sennacherib's arrival, as against Stade and Kittel, who date it later. ² P. 14.

³ “Taylor Cylinder,” col. iii., line 31. The Assyrian word is *urbi*. Schrader, Sayce, Ball (with a query), Price, Nagel, etc., render it “Arabians.” Others leave it untranslated.

⁴ “Taylor Cylinder,” col. ii., line 74. Schrader in the 2nd edition of the *K.A.T.*, English translation 289 f., still took Melukhkha as Ethiopia. In his map to the 3rd edition, Winckler places it south of the Gulf of Akabah on the Red Sea coast. Budge (preface to vol. vi., *History of Egypt*, p. xv.) thinks that Winckler's previous hypothesis of Melukhkha = Sinai and Midian has much probability. If Melukhkha be an Arabian state, it is surprising to find chariots mentioned among its forces.

It may be to negotiations before 701 between the South Palestine States and such Arab princes that Isaiah's *Oracle of the Beasts of the South* refers with its description of the passage of an embassy bearing treasure through the terrible desert.¹

Till recently Old Testament scholars and Assyriologists alike held that Hezekiah and his allies relied also upon help from Egypt, and that in response an Egyptian force appeared at the Battle of Eltekeh. Sennacherib includes among his foes there, along with the king of Melukhkha, "the king" or "kings of Muşuri"²; and this was taken to be the same as the Hebrew Mişraim or Egypt, divided at this time under several rulers. But since Dr. Winckler elaborated his arguments for the existence of an Arabian Muşri, Sennacherib's foes of that name at Eltekeh have been considered by a large number of scholars to have been as certainly Arabs as their allies of Melukhkha were. This opinion has been further supported by an appeal to the political condition of Egypt. In the second half of the 8th century and indeed till the appearance of Taharko in 691,³ Egypt, it is argued, owing to its divisions, was not capable of interfering in the politics of Palestine. Dr. Winckler indeed holds that wherever the Assyrian inscriptions of that period mention Muşri it is the Arabian Muşri which they mean—that, for example, it was not Egypt, as we have supposed, but the independent Arab state of the same (or a very similar) name which Sargon met at Raphia in 720 and which conspired with Ashdod and other South Palestine states in the rising against him of 713–711. The present is not the connection in which to discuss the ques-

¹ Isaiah xxx. 6 f.

² Tayl. Cyl. ii., 23, "Kings"; but other readings give "King"; cf. the Bull Inscr. l. 23.

³ According to W. Max Müller, *E. B.* col. 1245, this is the proper date for Taharko's achievement of the sovereignty of all Egypt. The formerly accepted date, 704, is "certainly improbable" (n. 2). See also the detailed argument for 691 in Prášek, *Sanherib's Feldzüge gegen Juda*, i. 34 ff., 1903.

tion between Dr. Winckler and those who deny that he has proved the existence of an Arabian Muşri.¹ Dr. Winckler has produced an amount of evidence for the Arabian Muşri which has convinced a number of leading scholars both in Germany and this country,² and even some who do not think him justified in all the assertions which he makes of the appearance of this state in the Assyrian and Jewish records.³ At the same time there are great difficulties, one of which is the existence of two independent states, bordering with each other and having names which are practically the same: MŞR. We must keep in mind that (as in modern times) Egypt, i.e., Muşr or Mişr (Mişraim) was not confined to Africa but covered the fringe of Asia as far as the Gulf of Aḩaba on the east, and Raphia near Gaza on the north—or just the territory which Dr. Winckler claims for his Arabian Muşri. It may have been thus that the name Muşr came to cover the latter and the Arab tribes which inhabited it; and, if the real Egypt between 745 and 691 was too weak to interfere with Assyrian operations in Palestine, it is quite possible that it is Arab tribes *only* whom the Assyrian inscriptions mean by Muşur or Muşuri. But though this is possible, to say that it is certain would be somewhat rash in our present fragmentary knowledge of Egypt at the time. Bakenrenef, the Bocchoris of the Greeks, who reigned at Sais in the last quarter of the century, evinced some power and left a great reputation. Either he or the vigorous Shabako who overcame him about 706⁴ may have been strong enough to attract the hopes of

¹ E.g. Dr. Budge, in the preface to vol. vi. of his *History of Egypt*.

² The English reader will of course consult Dr. Cheyne's "Mizraim," § 2b and other articles in the *E. B.*; cf. Hommel, "Assyria" in *Hastings D. B.* i. 187 f.; in German, Guthe, *Gesch.* 219 f.

³ E.g. Nagel, *Der Zug des Sanherib gegen Jerusalem*, 1902, p. 98, who admits the existence of an Arabian Muşri and its appearance at Eltekeh in 701, but argues that the Muşri of Sargon's inscriptions is Egypt.

⁴ "706 (?) " W. Max Müller, *E. B.* col. 1244 f. Shabako certainly corresponded with Assyria; two of his seals have been discovered in the royal library at Nineveh.

the South Palestine cities in their fear before Sennacherib's advance.

In such uncertainty we must leave the question. But it does not much affect our present purpose. What is clear is that on the approach of Sennacherib, Hezekiah and his allies sought and found support from Arab tribes and kingdoms; this is proved from the presence of Arab mercenaries in Jerusalem, and of the forces of the king of Melukhkha at the Battle of Eltekeh. What is not certain is whether Egyptian soldiers were also present at Eltekeh. The name Muşuri applied by Sennacherib to some of his foes there may mean Egyptians (as all scholars used to think) or Arab tribes from Asiatic Egypt (as the present writer thinks most probable), or, on Dr. Winckler's argument, the forces of an Arabian land, Muşur, which at the time was independent of Egypt.¹

Sennacherib having settled affairs in Phoenicia, advanced upon Hezekiah and his allies. We need not suppose that his inscriptions give the exact chronological order of all his operations. For instance, they report the restoration of Padi to power in Ekron immediately after the capture of the city, while it is more probable that Hezekiah did not deliver up Padi till after his own submission and payment of tribute. But in the main the inscriptions follow the natural course of such a campaign.² Coming down the sea-coast Sennacherib took first Ashkelon and its subject cities: Beth-dagon, Joppa, Bene-berak and Azuru. Then he turned to meet the southern forces, whom the coalition had summoned to its help: the kings of Muşur

¹ If Dr. Winckler be right, that Egypt was too weak to interfere in S. Palestine before Tirhakah's ascension, or to attract the hopes of Hezekiah and his allies, whose only reliance, when Sennacherib approached to attack them, was on an Arabian Muşri, then we may have to remove the oracles of Isaiah on Egypt in Chaps. xxx. ff. from 705-701 (to which they are generally assigned) to the next decade.

² See *Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land*, pp. 235 f.

and the warriors of the king of Melukhkha; and defeated them at Eltekeh (unknown but probably on the Philistine plain). Then he took Ekron and was now free to turn against the most secure and formidable of the allies, Hezekiah. Sennacherib appears not to have immediately advanced on Jerusalem. Whether because his victory at Eltekeh had not finally dispersed the danger of an attack by an army from the south, and he could not therefore afford to lead his main force against Jerusalem; or because, like the Seleucid generals and Vespasian, he appreciated the strength of Jerusalem and the waterlessness of her surroundings, so dangerous to all her besiegers, and knew that he must not hope to take her before making sure of the rest of the land, he began with the latter. 'But Hezekiah of Jerusalem, who had not submitted to me, forty-six of his walled towns, numberless forts and small places in their neighbourhood I invested and took by means of battering rams and the assault of scaling-ladders (? siege towers) the attack of foot-soldiers, mines, breaches and . . .¹ Two hundred thousand one hundred and fifty, great and small, men and women, horses, mules, asses, camels, oxen and sheep without number I carried off from them and counted as spoil.'² While these operations proceeded,³ part of the Assyrian army blockaded Jerusalem. 'Himself I shut up like a bird in a cage in Jerusalem his royal city. I raised forts about him and the exits of (or whatever came forth from) the chief gate of his city I barred. His towns which I spoiled I severed from his territory and gave them to Mitinti, king of Ashdod, Padi, king of Ekron, and Šilbil, king of Gaza; so I diminished his territory.'⁴ The blockade of Jerusalem.

¹ So after Ball and Nagel, the former of whom renders the last three terms, 'mines, bills and axes': Taylor Cyl. iii. 11-17. ² Id. 17-20.

³ Because later, when Hezekiah submitted, we find Sennacherib still investing Lachish, doubtless one of the Judæan towns, since Hezekiah had already overrun Philistia up to Gaza.

⁴ Taylor Cyl. 20-26, after Schrader and Ball.

brought Hezekiah to terms. 'Himself the fear of my august Lordship overpowered. The Arabians and his faithful ones whom he had brought in for the defence of Jerusalem his royal city, fell away.¹ Along with 30 talents of gold and 800 of silver, precious stones, carbuncles, *kassû* stones, great pieces of lapis lazuli, ivory thrones, elephant hides (and) tusks, *ushu* wood, box-wood, all sorts of things, a huge treasure, and his own daughters, the women-folk of his palace, men and women singers he brought after me to Nineveh the city of my Lordship; and for the payment of the tribute and to do homage, 'he despatched his envoy.'²

This account asserts or implies the following: the conquest of all Judah, with the overthrow of the principal cities except Jerusalem, and the captivity of a large portion of the country population; the blockade of Jerusalem, but neither its siege³ nor its capture; the payment by Hezekiah of a costly tribute; and the departure of Sennacherib, before even the tribute could be paid, to Nineveh. The Bas-Relief in the British Museum proves in addition that among the cities taken and spoiled by Sennacherib was Lachish. For the reason of Sennacherib's swift return to Nineveh we cannot be at a loss. It must have been news of the revolt of his vassal Bel-Ibni in Babylon. Against this rebel Sennacherib's next campaign in 700 was directed.

There is no doubt that the Biblical parallel to Sennacherib's record of his suddenly ended campaign in Southern Palestine is found in 2 Kings xviii 13-16: *In the fourteenth*

¹ So Ball and Nagel; cf. Delitzsch, *Assyr. Handwörterbuch*, 171a. Others translate differently.

² Taylor Cyl. iii 29-41: after Ball and Schrader.

³ The inscription does not use the usual word for siege, but a word that probably means 'blockade': cf. Prášek, *Sanherib's Feldzüge gegen Juda*, p. 21; in the *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1903, 4. Cf. Winckler, *A. T. Untersuchungen*, p. 31.

year of king Hîzkiyah Sanherib, king of Ashshûr, came up against all the fortified cities of Judah and took them; and Hîzkiyah, king of Judah, sent to the king of Ashshûr to Lachish saying: I have sinned; turn from against me, what thou layest upon me I will bear; and the king of Ashshûr laid upon Hîzkiyah, king of Judah, 300 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold. And Hîzkiyah gave all the silver, found in the house of Jahweh and in the treasuries of the king. At that time Hîzkiyah stripped the doors of the temple of Jahweh and the pillars which Hîzkiyah, king of Judah, had overlaid and gave it to the king of Ashshûr. The first verse of this passage, verse 13, is found in Isaiah xxxvi. 1, the rest are wanting there. The independence of the passage from what follows it in 2 Kings xvii., and is also given in Isaiah xxxvi. 2 ff., is shown by the fact that the name of the king of Judah is spelt Hîzkiyah, while in the latter passages it is Hîzkiyahu.

To the same campaign of Sennacherib in 701 we may confidently refer the long discourse by Isaiah, now placed as a preface to his prophecies, ch. i. 2-26. Take verses 7-9:—

*Your land is a desolation, your cities are burned with fire,
To your face strangers are devouring your soil
(And it is desolate, like the overturning of Sodom).¹
The daughter of Sion is left like a hut in a vineyard,
Like a lodge in a garden of cucumbers,
Like a city besieged.²
Unless Jahweh of hosts had left us a remnant,
Almost as Sodom had we become,
To Gomorrah had been levelled.*

To the same year of 701 is usually assigned chap. xxii. 1-14.

¹ So Ewald, Lagarde, Cheyne, and others, reading סדרם for the unmeaning זרים. The clause, however, is taken by some as a later insertion, on the ground that it breaks into the couplets of the verse-form.

² This clause is strange after the previous comparisons, unless Isaiah spoke it before the actual blockade of Jerusalem.

It seems hardly possible to take this passage as a unity.¹ Owing to the corruption of the text it is difficult, if not impossible, to detect the seam between the two pieces: hence the diverse modern divisions of the passage. But not only are the opening verses (1-5 at least) in one rhythm, and the closing (11b-14) in another; they do not appear to describe the same phase of the fickle temper of the City. Verses 1-2a exhibit the people on the housetops in a joyous celebration, to which the prophet opposes, in 2b-5, his vision of an imminent disgraceful defeat—flight and captivity of the leaders without resistance—merging into a picture of *a day of the Lord*. On the other hand, verses 8-14² rebuke the people for trusting in their preparations for a siege instead of in God; and then, as if even that material confidence has given way, depicts them, while God calls them to repentance, losing their balance altogether and plunging into a desperate self-indulgence—*for to-morrow we die*. This is a very different mood from that pictured in the opening verses. Let us take verses 11-14 first. Professors Cheyne, Skinner, and Marti refer this oracle to the people's relief upon the sudden withdrawal of the

¹ Formerly the universal opinion (shared by the present writer, *Expositor's Bible, Isaiah i.-xxxix.*), and still held by Prof. Skinner (*Camb. Bible*, 162 ff.); cf. Robertson Smith, *Prophets*, 1st ed., 316 f. Duhm divides the passages into two oracles of Isaiah: (a) 1-7, on an unknown occasion which moved the city to mirth, which the prophet answers by a vision of destruction; (b) 8-14, the prophet's rebuke of the city's trust in its preparations against a siege and its subsequent desperate levity. Marti distinguishes three pieces: (a) 1-5, in the Kinah measure. To the city, in an exultant mood Isaiah announces his vision of the overthrow of its leaders without resistance; (b) 6-11, the work of a later writer, because of the mention of Elam, which cannot have been among the Assyrian forces in 701; (c) 12-14, Isaiah's, from the same occasion as 1-5, the thoughtless joy of the citizens at the withdrawal of the Assyrians in 701. Cheyne (*SBOT.*, p. 163: see further *Crit. Bibl.*) distinguishes 1-5 and 6-14, both on the Assyrian withdrawal, the latter describing the rebound of the citizens from despair to hope. He thinks something has fallen out from the beginning of the second piece. All three take *vv. 9b-11a* as a gloss.

² Perhaps this passage begins earlier.

was lifted, and possibly on the desertion of the same hirelings along with some of the native Jews.

II.

So much at least, then, happened in 701, and is covered by Isaiah xxxvi. 1 and the parallel 2 Kings xviii. 13-16, Isaiah i. and (probably) xxii. 1-14. The blockade was lifted, and Hezekiah sent tribute to Sennacherib at Lachish, or, according to Sennacherib's own account, to Nineveh, whither the Assyrian king implies he suddenly returned.

But there immediately follow on Isaiah xxxvi. 1 and 2 Kings xviii. 13-16 the accounts of two Assyrian expeditions to Jerusalem. *First*, the Rabshakeh is sent with an army to Jerusalem, and demands her surrender, but Isaiah emboldens Hezekiah to defiance by predicting that the king of Assyria shall hear a rumour, return to his own land, and fall there by the sword (2 Kings xviii. 17-xix. 8, parallel with Isaiah xxxvi. 2-xxxvii. 8). *Second*, on the return of the Rabshakeh Sennacherib hearing that Tirhakah, king of Egypt, is advancing, sends a letter to Hezekiah once more demanding the surrender of Jerusalem. Hezekiah spreads the letter with prayer before God; Isaiah tells him the Assyrian is overruled by God and will return without coming near Jerusalem; an angel smites of the Assyrians 185,000 men in a single night; Sennacherib returns to Nineveh and is murdered by his sons in the Temple of Nisroch (2 Kings xix. 9-37, parallel with Isaiah xxxvii. 9-38¹).

¹ The verses describing the visitation on the Assyrian army, the return of Sennacherib and his murder, are assigned by many to the first account. The line between the two accounts is very sharp. 2 Kings xix. 8 tells of the return of the Rabshakeh from Jerusalem to the king of Assyria at Libnah. But the subject of the verb, *and he heard*, in verse 9 is not the Rabshakeh but the king of Assyria. With this verse, then, a new narrative obviously begins.

The questions which arise upon these two narratives are as follows: (1) What are their date, character and value? (2) Are they the accounts of two separate expeditions to demand the surrender of Jerusalem, or parallel versions of one and the same expedition? (3) In either case, do they refer to 701 or to a later campaign of Sennacherib in Palestine? These are questions to all of which diametrically opposite answers have been given with equal confidence. I do not think such confidence is justified in either direction: our evidence is incomplete, and as it stands conflicting. We can but state the questions and give the probable answers—probable, but even when most probable not always compatible with each other.

(1) I have space only for a summary treatment of the first question. 2 Kings xviii. 13–16, which (as we have seen) is the Hebrew parallel to Sennacherib's account of his invasion of 701, is generally recognized as an extract from the official annals of Judah. But the two accounts which follow it and which, besides differently spelling the name of Hezekiah, are couched not in an annalistic but a narrative style, are usually taken to be of that class of prophetic biographies upon which the compiler of the Book of Kings has so largely drawn.¹ The two accounts contain obvious editorial additions.² The compiler certainly did not finish his work before the Exile, roughly speaking the middle of the sixth century, and to him may be assigned the possibly late linguistic traces which the text of the two accounts contain.³ The foreshortening of the period

¹ As, for example, in the cases of Elijah and Elisha.

² E.g. xviii. 17: *The Tartan and the Rabsaris* for verses 17–19 imply the presence only of the Rabshakeh, cf. xix. 8; *son of Amos*, cf. Kautzsch *in loco*: xix. 10: *Thus shall ye speak to H. king of Judah, saying* (Kautzsch).

³ For example, the name *Jewish* (instead of Hebrew) for the language of the people of Jerusalem (2 Kings xviii. 26, 28), not elsewhere used in the O.T. except in the post-exilic Neh. xiii. 24, and objected to on the ground that it could not have come into use so soon after the fall of Samaria and the sole survival of Judah as the end of the 8th or begin-

between Sennacherib's return from Palestine and his murder in 681 may also be due to the distance of the compiler from these events.¹ More precarious evidence of the compiler's alteration of his material is found in the religious temper of the two accounts; their monotheism, especially in Hezekiah's prayer, is alleged to be too pure for a date before the Deuteronomic influence and the prophecies of the Second Isaiah²; while the representation of Isaiah as a mediator between God and men, to convey the Divine answer to prayer or to give omens for the future, is held to be a conception of the prophetic office formed by an age later than Isaiah's.³ To the present writer this line of argument is very uncertain. Isaiah during his long career, and by the vindication of several of his predictions, may well have achieved a religious authority of a degree sufficient to create among his countrymen the sacred conception of him prevailing in these narratives. Again, the mention by the first narrative of Hezekiah's expectation of help from Egypt and the assertion that he will be disappointed are not impossible (as some have alleged) before Tirhakah's conquest of all Egypt in 691; but are quite consistent with Isaiah's own oracles, so generally assigned to 705-701, upon the futility of Jewish reliance upon Egyptian aid. On the other hand a great many of the details in the two accounts can hardly be the invention of the late compiler. Nagel may have overstated the case for

ning of the 7th century. Nagel argues that its use was quite possible after 681, subsequent to which year he places the two accounts in consequence of their mention of Sennacherib's death. Other expressions alleged to be late are the Deuteronomic phrases in Hezekiah's prayer, 2 Kings xix. 15 ff.; the words *יְהוָה* and *פְּלִטָה* in xix. 31, which Cheyne calls post-Isaian, but this is very doubtful (see Nagel's answer); and the expressions *for my sake*, and *for the sake of my servant David* (so Kuenen and others).

¹ So Kuenen, and since him many others.

² So Meinhold and others.

³ So Marti.

the credibility of the narratives¹; but there can be no doubt that much of the graphic and detailed description in these is most naturally explained as the work of a contemporary, if not an eyewitness, of the events recorded. The two narratives, then, owe their present form, including perhaps some re-arrangement and overlapping and probably some errors, not now always possible to distinguish, to their late compilation, but the attempt to prove them substantially unsound cannot be maintained.²

(2) Since Stade's analysis of the two narratives,³ the prevailing tendency of criticism has been to refer both to 701 as parallel versions of the same course of events in that year.⁴ This theory lays stress upon the elements common to both narratives: the dispatch of a mission by Sennacherib to demand the surrender of Jerusalem; the similarity of the terms of the speech of the Rabshakeh in the first narrative with those of the letter given in the second; Hezekiah's reference of both speech and letter to his God; the intervention in both cases of Isaiah and his encouragement of Hezekiah to defy Sennacherib; while the discrepancies between the two narratives are held upon this theory to be "perhaps not greater than between parallel accounts in the four gospels."⁵ This is by no means conclusive. Alternative explanations of the simi-

¹ In his sections on the Credibility of the Hebrew account in *Der Zug des Sanherib gegen Jerusalem*.

² Prášek (*op. cit.* 25 ff.) divides the first narrative into a short summary from the annals of Judah, 2 Kings xviii. 17, 18 and xix. 8, of good historical value, and a prophetic narrative of the time of the Exile. So definite a division cannot be pronounced successful.—The oracles attributed to Isaiah in 2 Kings xix. 21-34 have been doubted. They vary in rhythm and some of the verses contain some of the late features already noted. But even if parts, or all, of them be omitted, a substantial narrative remains.

ZATH, vi. 1886.

⁴ This view has been adopted by Prof. Skinner in so recent a volume as the "Century Bible," *Kings* (p. 388), and maintained against the new hypothesis of Winekler.

⁵ Skinner, *Isaiah i.-xxxix.*, p. 262.

larities are, to say the least, equally probable. For in part they may be due to the borrowing by one account of some of the exact terms of the other¹; and, still more, they may have arisen from the natural analogies between two very similar historical situations in which the chief actors were the same. If Sennacherib sent two different missions to demand the surrender of Jerusalem—a fact not in itself improbable—he would naturally repeat himself, nor is it less likely that Hezekiah and Isaiah would render him on both occasions similar replies. On the other hand, the discrepancies between the two narratives are greater than the adherents of the theory of their parallelism allow; and the existence of these discrepancies is, on the whole, more consistent with the explanation of the narratives as continuous of each other. In the second, there is no allusion to the Fall of Samaria, which is very explicable if this second refers to events later than the first. In the second, Sennacherib no longer taunts Hezekiah with the futility of a reliance upon Egypt: again a natural omission if, as the compilation of the two narratives states, Tirhakah of Egypt had at last become able to advance into Palestine. There is also an apparent difference in the positions assigned to Sennacherib by the two narratives respectively. In the first he is in Judah, not far from Jerusalem, to which he is able to send an army detached from his great host. In the second, he is not near, and Isaiah asserts he will not come near.² There is also a difference between the temper ascribed to Hezekiah in the first narrative and that in which he is shown to us in the second; in the latter he is no longer seized by panic, but is calm. This change is very naturally explained, both if we assume that Hezekiah had already passed through the discipline described in the

¹ For example, the list of towns already conquered by Assyria.

² Prašek's contention (*op. cit.* 32, 37) that the letter of Sennacherib in the second narrative implies that Jerusalem was besieged by the Assyrians and hard pressed at the time the letter was sent, is quite unfounded.

first narrative, and if we suppose (as we have just seen reason to do) that on the second occasion Sennacherib was at a greater distance from the capital. Again, in the first narrative Hezekiah sends a solemn embassy to Isaiah; but in the second Isaiah sends of his own accord to Hezekiah. And finally, while in the first narrative Isaiah announces that Sennacherib's departure from Palestine will be due to a rumour that he shall hear, in the second this is not implied, and the cause of his departure is stated to be a pestilence.¹

While, then, the similarities in the two narratives are explicable on other grounds than that they are parallel versions of the same events, their differences are less consistent with such a theory than they are with the interpretation of the two narratives as the accounts of successive events. And even some of the adherents of the theory of parallelism admit that the two narratives let themselves be read as a continuous whole.

(3) This leads us to our third question; If the two narratives imply two successive Assyrian missions to Jerusalem to demand the surrender of the City, did both of these missions take place in 701, or was the first in that year and the second some years later?

The hypothesis that Isaiah xxxvi.-xxxvii. records the results of two Assyrian invasions of Palestine separated by an interval of some years was advanced by British Biblical critics from a comparatively early date. Apart from the idea of Dr. Hincks² that the first of these was Sargon's campaign of 711, and the second that of Sennacherib in 701, Sir Henry Rawlinson distinguished between a first successful campaign of Sennacherib and a second and later unsuccessful expedition by the same monarch.³ This theory met

¹ There is really no sufficient reason for assigning the story of the pestilence to the first narrative.

² Followed for a time by Professors Cheyne and Schrader.

³ See G. Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 1862.

with opposition from Professor Schrader, and was supposed by critics generally to have been disproved, on the grounds that there is no space in the Biblical records for the second campaign, and that there was no word about it in the Assyrian annals.¹ Recently, however, some Assyrian evidence has appeared, which, though unfortunately not conclusive, points towards the fact of a second Palestine campaign by Sennacherib some years later than that of 701. This consists, *first*, of an allusion in the annals of Esarhaddon to a campaign by Sennacherib in northern Arabia.² As Esarhaddon repeated this, and continued its probable purpose by the invasion of Egypt, it was argued that Sennacherib himself had advanced from his Arabian conquests at least as far as the frontier of Egypt, and in support of this appeal was made to the Egyptian tradition of the Assyrian overthrow and retreat reported in Herodotus ii. 141, which calls Sennacherib "king of the Arabians and Assyrians," a title that implies his Arabian conquest. On those grounds Winckler has argued for a campaign in Palestine by Sennacherib after 690, of which the Biblical account is found in the record of the two narratives we have been discussing (2 Kings xix. 8-37)³; and has been supported by Hommel,⁴ Benzinger,⁵ Guthe,⁶ and others.⁷ *Second*: Last year Father Scheil⁸ announced

¹ See also the arguments of Prof. Cheyne in *Introd. to the Bk. of Isaiah*, pp. 234 f.; and Prof. Rogers' *Hist.*, vol. ii., 203, n. 4. Cf. Meinhold, *Jesaia und seine Zeit*, ii. ff.

² In which he took the fortress of Adumu variously identified with Petra, and with Dumat in the Jöf (the Dumata of Pliny): cf. Duma of Isaiah xxi. 11.

³ *Alt. Or. Untersuchungen*, 1889, esp. p. 259; *A. T. Untersuchungen*, 41 f.; *KAT*, 3rd ed., 1902, 272 f.

⁴ Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, i., 1886.

⁵ *Commentary on Kings*.

⁶ *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*.

⁷ Budge (*Hist. of Egypt*, vi. 149) says that the compiler of the Book of Kings has confused two sieges of Jerusalem: one when Shabataka was king of Egypt, and a second when Tirhaka was king.

⁸ In the *Orient. Literaturzeitung*, 1904, 2. Cp. Weber's *Sanherib* in Heft 3 of "Der Alte Orient" for 1905.

the discovery of a fragment of Sennacherib's own annals, which imply that between 691 and 689 Sennacherib undertook, in consequence of a revolt of his western vassals encouraged by the activity of Tirhakah, a campaign westwards, but the fragment does not carry the progress of the campaign farther than N. Arabia. In this uncertain state the question must now be left pending the discovery of further evidence.

But meantime it may be pointed out how far the hypothesis of a second campaign by Sennacherib in Palestine suits the Biblical record. In the first place, before Father Scheil's discovery this second campaign was supposed to have taken place late in the eighties of the seventh century. But we now know that, whether or not the campaign extended to Palestine, it took place between 691 and 689, which would bring it within the possible extent of Hezekiah's reign and Isaiah's career. By that time, too, Tirhakah had certainly become lord of all Egypt—the most probable date for this event being, according to Egyptologists, 691. With all this are consistent the introduction of his name at the beginning of the second Biblical narrative, and the abstention of Sennacherib, in the letter which this narrative records, from all such emphasis as the Rabshakeh's speech lays upon the futility of Judah's hope of help from Egypt. Such hope was not futile now that Tirhakah was advancing. And, finally, if the second Biblical narrative refers to a campaign of Sennacherib in 690 or 689, it is more easy to understand why there was included in it a notice of Sennacherib's murder in 681, than if it refers to the campaign of 701, which was distant twenty years from that murder.

On the evidence then at present at our disposal, imperfect though it may be, the theory seems (on the whole) most probable that the first narrative refers to 701, the second

to a later campaign of Sennacherib about 690, and the late compilation of the two narratives would be sufficient explanation of their apparent reference to events following immediately upon one another during the same Assyrian campaign. But we must keep in mind that this is still only a hypothesis, and that it is not unattended by objections. I have space here only to speak of one of these. It is the first narrative which tells of Hezekiah's removal of the rural sanctuaries and centralization of the worship of Jahweh in Jerusalem. But the difficulty is to find a place or a sufficient motive for these before 701. They would most naturally fall after the devastation of the rural sanctuaries by Sennacherib's army in that year, and the unique inviolableness of the sanctuary in Jerusalem. The verse in the Rabshakeh's speech describing the reforms (2 Kings xviii. 22) has been very generally regarded as an interpolation. It is certainly out of place where it stands, and would be more in order after verse 24. But it may have belonged originally to the second narrative.

In any case, the causes of that addition of a great sacredness to Jerusalem, which becomes evident in the seventh century, are apparent. Isaiah had idealized the City and Temple; for some years he had insisted on the inviolableness of Zion. The Assyrian invasion of 701 had overrun the rest of Judah, more or less discrediting the influence, if not actually destroying the fabric, of the rural sanctuaries; and carrying off a very large number of their worshippers into captivity. And at least once in 701, and probably again eleven years later, Jerusalem had been wonderfully delivered from the investment and the further threatenings of Assyria.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

“THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.”

A NOTE ON 1 PETER I. 11.

“THE sufferings of Christ”: this seems a somewhat forced and therefore doubtful rendering of the Greek τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα. It is left unaltered by the Revised Version, but the American Revisers (1901) suggest, in their margin at least, “unto,” and thereby draw attention to the peculiarity of the phrase. The commentators also seem for the most part to be satisfied with the rendering, and Dr. Hort is the only one, so far as I have observed, who discusses the use of the preposition, and offers what may be illustrations. He seeks to do justice to the preposition, first of all, in his translation, *scil.* “the sufferings destined for the Messiah.” Here we note two points. First, the admission that some attempt must be made to explain the use of εἰς and to account for its presence in place of the genitive. For the sense in which the ordinary reader takes the English words a simple genitive would have been not only sufficient, but, we should say, inevitable: we have only to turn to iv. 13 of this Epistle or to 1 Corinthians i. 5 to find the obvious Greek equivalent of “the sufferings of the Christ.” And Dr. Hort accordingly rules out this commonly accepted interpretation. “This cannot possibly mean the sufferings of Christ in our sense of the words, i.e. the sufferings which as a matter of history befell the historical Christ. It is intelligible only from the point of view of the prophets and their contemporaries, the sufferings destined for Messiah.” In support of the meaning which he would thus assign to εἰς Dr. Hort does not bring any illustration from the New Testament, but quotes several passages from early Christian literature. But none of these parallels proves on closer examination to be quite cogent. The three Greek phrases (from Ignatius and Barnabas) have this feature in common

among themselves and different from the phrase in Peter, that in all three the word which in construction precedes the preposition is a verb, and a verb of preaching or prophesying. With such it is not difficult to connect the idea of direction and so the preposition εἰς. No one of these would be patient of a rendering "destined for" or the like. And the cases from Tertullian (four in all) exactly correspond with these, the word in each instance being a verb and that some form of "predicare." In Peter, on the other hand, the notable thing and the thing which asks for explanation is the fact that the preposition follows not on a verb but on a substantive, and the substantive itself is one from which the idea of direction through the preposition to a person is rather conspicuously absent.

The immediate context seems at first sight to provide a useful if not a decisive parallel in the phrase in v. 10: οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες. And to this Alford points as a sufficient justification of the rendering "destined for," although he gives as well a variant in our passage, *scil.* "sufferings regarding (spoken with reference to) Christ." And von Soden (*Handcommentar*) accepts the same explanation, though he gives no further parallels. And yet even here there is a want of exactness in the parallel; the use of the preposition after a word like παθήματα is hardly to be justified by its use after χάριτος, which so readily suggests the idea of conveyance or communication, and so invites the preposition εἰς.

Dr. Hort's second point to which I have alluded touches on the significance to be attached to the word "Christ" in this phrase. And herein seems to me to lie the clue to the true interpretation. By "Christ" the Apostle does not mean in this case to refer to historical Jesus of the Gospels, but to the anticipative portrait of the Deliverer to come which rose with more or less distinctness before the vision of the prophets and apocalyptists and bore the name of the

Messiah or the Christ. The objection which at once occurs, viz. that here there is no article before the proper name, has been met in advance by Dr. Hort. It is true that the anarthrous formula appears at first sight capable only of one reference, and that to Jesus, whether in the flesh or in His glory. But this is more than doubtful. "Many assume that the article is indispensable if the Messiah is meant. This, however, is an untenable assumption." The one case of such a use of *Χριστός* without the article which Dr. Hort quotes (Mark i. 34) rests on a reading which is doubly doubtful both as to the article and as to the whole phrase. But there is force in his remark that "in St. John we find *Μεσσίας* iv. 25 as well as *τὸν Μεσσίαν* i. 41, and there is no probability that *Χριστός* would in like manner be used by Jews speaking Greek as well as *ὁ Χριστός*. Indeed without this preliminary supposition the apostolic use of *Χριστός* without an article would be difficult to explain." And the Psalms of Solomon provide an interesting parallel (xvii. 32) *πάντες ἄγιοι καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν Χριστὸς κυρίου*, regarding which Kittel's note should be consulted.

This anarthrous use of the name is discussed by Dr. Hort in connexion with the earlier phrase "the spirit of Christ"; and having come to the above conclusion he renders the whole: "searching for what or what manner of season the spirit of Messiah in them was disclosing, protesting beforehand of the sufferings destined for Messiah." (He takes no notice of the fact recorded by Alford that in the first instance the word *Χριστός* is wanting in Cod. Vaticanus.)

If this reasoning is so far correct, viz., that the rendering of *εἰς* by "destined for" after a word like *παθήματα* is difficult to parallel and in itself forced, and that the name *Χριστός* even without the article may be applied to the Messiah as he appeared still in the future to the vision of those who received the testimony of His Spirit,—the sugges-

tion which I have to make seems to lie ready to hand. It is that we should understand by this phrase "the sufferings which lead up to Messiah, or to Messiah's coming." In the first place, this gives a natural and unforced rendering to the preposition. In the second, it harmonises, if I mistake not, with the circle of ideas in which the writer's mind was moving. That leads us to inquire, Who were "the prophets" who sought and searched diligently into these questions? The commentators who touch on this point are content to refer to those prophets of the Old Testament in whose writings there are passages capable of a Messianic interpretation: and they find confirmation of this as the source of prophecies specially referring to "sufferings" in Luke xxiv. 26, 27. But this is to overlook the emphasis laid upon the *search* and also the special subject of search which is here insisted upon. This subject is the season or the character of the season to which the spirit of Messiah in them did point. It was the "times" of great events in the future for which they were searching; or, if that could not be ascertained, then "the general character of the attendant circumstances," not the events themselves. And it was on these points that the Spirit had given them indications concurrently with testimony as to τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα. Now, if we ask where are such "prophets" to be found, the answer is that such investigations and such communications begin indeed with Daniel (cf. ix. 24-27, etc.), but become abundant in the period which opens with Daniel, the literature of the Apocalypses. I may recall here the very attractive suggestion of Professor Rendel Harris, that the writer of this Epistle is just about to make direct allusion to one of the most famous of these. The phrase in the twelfth verse: "to whom it was revealed that not unto themselves but unto you did they minister these things" has no source or parallel which can be discovered in the Old Testament, whereas it finds a very

remarkable parallel in the opening of the Book of Enoch : "Not for the present generation did I ponder, but for the generation to come." It is true that in this particular book (in the original parts at least) the figure of the Messiah Himself does not make its appearance¹; but references to the Messianic Woes are not wanting, and in the Vision of the Ten Weeks there is precisely that attempt to forecast the time or the character of the time at which the end might be expected, to which allusion is here made. The Fourth Book of Esra furnishes similar parallels. The writer is markedly conscious of his own eagerness in seeking to understand "the ways of God" (iv. 2), even to the extent of "burrowing" in the search (xii. 4): and he is specially anxious to be informed as to the time of the end. Thus (iv. 34) "I answered and said, How long yet? When shall it be? Our life is so short and wretched. But he answered and said: Wilt thou hasten faster than the Most High? Thou wouldest have haste for thine own sake, but the Most High for the sake of many."

It is hardly necessary, however, to illustrate the double point that the Apocalyptic literature as a whole is at once closely concerned with the "time" or period of the end and the "manner of time," the character of the period preceding the coming of the Messiah. One of the most striking features of that period as described in this literature is of course the *παθήματα*, and with almost equal fulness are enumerated the *δόξαι* which are to follow. The Book of Jubilees furnishes as good an illustration as any other. "For calamity follows on calamity, and wound on wound, and tribulation on tribulation, and evil tidings on evil tidings, and illness on illness, and all evil judgments such as these one with another, illness and overthrow, and snow and frost, and ice and fever and chills, and torpor and famine, and death and sword, and captivity and all kinds of calamities and pains." These

¹ Bousset, *Religion des Judenthums*, p. 209.

are the *παθήματα*, the *ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων* or "beginning of birth-pangs" (Matt. xxiv. 8), the travail out of which the new (Messianic) age is to be born. "The days of the children of men will begin to grow many, and increase from generation to generation, and day to day, till their days draw near to a thousand years, and to a greater number of years than (before) were their days. And there will be no old man, not one that is not satisfied with his days; for all will be (as) children and youths" (xxiii. 27; tr. Charles). These are some of the *δόξαι*. And the transition from the one to the other is either in the coming of Messiah or in the crisis which corresponds to it.

There appears, then, to be good reason to believe that the mind of the writer of this Epistle was moving in this circle of ideas, and that his allusion here is to these "prophets" and to their predictions of sufferings to come and of glory to follow. And it would be quite consistent with the Apocalyptic method if he gave to these former prophecies an interpretation suited to the new age. It was the Parousia or appearance of Christ "a second time unto salvation" of which he was thinking, and for him the "manifold trials" were the sufferings which were to lead up to the return of Christ.

I should like to suggest also that if this interpretation be correct, it may throw light on another difficult phrase in the Epistles, Paul's "I fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ." None of the interpretations which are commonly offered seems entirely satisfactory. The governing idea in the sentence appears to be that of an ordained measure of suffering to the completion of which the Apostle is somehow contributing. That this refers to the sufferings of the historical Jesus is hardly possible, and not to be supported from Scripture. That it refers to the sufferings of Christ in or with His Church can hardly be the primary meaning, however true it might be as

a secondary and mystical interpretation. But if we could take τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ (the article being present encourages the suggestion) as equivalent to "the sufferings of Messiah" and that to "the Messianic woes," we should have a conception to which the category of measure could be applied, and indeed was applied in the Apocalyptic literature. It was when these woes were complete that, according to Jewish expectation, the Messiah would appear. And it would lie close to St. Paul's hand to place a similar interpretation upon the sufferings which he and others were called upon to undergo in the cause of Christ. The writer of the Apocalypse applies this standard of measure not to the sufferings, but to the sufferers themselves: "It was said unto them (the martyrs) that they should rest yet for a little time until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, which should be killed even as they were, should be fulfilled.

C. ANDERSON SCOTT.

NOTE ON "THE CENSUS OF THE ISRAELITES."

IN connexion with the twelve tribes belonging to the Exodus census, without Levi being included, it should be observed that this bears strongly in favour of the early date of the blessings of Jacob (Gen. xlix.), where Levi is only inserted by being coupled with Simeon. This shows that the blessings are of a period before the census was misunderstood, when Levi was reckoned separately. And if the blessings are thus as early as the census lists of the Exodus, they may be taken back still earlier; for in the Exodus census Ephraim and Manasseh are separate, while in the blessings they are all one in Joseph. Thus the internal evidence points to the blessings being as early as the Egyptian sojourn.

W. M. F. P.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

XII. THE LIMITATION OF KNOWLEDGE.

(1) THE scope and the content of the knowledge of Jesus is a problem of urgent interest and supreme importance for Christian scholarship to-day. The traditional orthodoxy has with absolute confidence appealed to the authority of Jesus against the results of the Higher Criticism in relation to the Old Testament; and has forced on the Christian Church the choice between Christ and the higher critics. These have replied by affirming that on all the questions with which scholarship is concerned Jesus shared the opinions of His own age and people, as information on such subjects was not included in the revelation of God as Father, which was given to Him. The *kenosis* or self-emptying of the Son of God in the Incarnation necessarily involved the limitation of His knowledge on all matters not directly relating to His fulfilment of His vocation. Without denying the humiliation of the Word in the flesh, the traditional orthodoxy hesitates about accepting this practical application of the doctrine, and with the grounds of this hesitation those who cherish their Christian faith as their most precious possession cannot but sincerely and cordially sympathise. If Jesus, it is urged, is only a man of His own age and people as regards His knowledge, what assurance can be given that His revelation of God is true, and His redemption of man is real. The tendency of modern Christian thought to abandon not only the infallible *Church* of Catholicism, but even

the infallible *Bible* of Protestantism as the seat of authority in religion and morals, and to take refuge in the infallible *Christ* for certainty as regards faith and duty, adds force to this plea. Can we from the data afforded by the Gospels derive such a view of the mind of Christ as will free scholarship of all galling fetters, and yet give faith the assurance it craves?

(2) Setting aside all merely logical inferences drawn from the ecclesiastical dogma of the Person of Christ, we turn to the facts of the evangelical history, on which alone the Christian doctrine ought to be based. Jesus Himself fixes the centre and describes the circumference of His own knowledge; and it is not Christian reverence to disregard His own witness to Himself in favour of our own theories of His person. In Matthew xi. 25-30 He claims to be known as Son by God as by no other, to know God as Father and to reveal Him as no other can; the secret of His own nature is hid with God, as the secret of God's nature is given to Him alone to reveal. The condition of His intimate relation to God is absolute dependence, for all He hath has been delivered to Him by His Father, and entire submission, for He desires only what is well-pleasing in His Father's sight; in short the meekness and lowliness in heart that He claims for Himself (verse 29). We are warranted then in assuming that the condition of His receiving the revelation of the Father is the same as the condition of receiving that revelation from Him. It is hidden from the wise and understanding, and is received by babes; it is by taking His yoke and learning of Him, that is, by becoming meek and lowly as He was, that the rest the knowledge of the Father gives is found. Filial dependence and filial submission are the conditions of filial communion; as these conditions necessarily imply, as will afterwards be shown, limitation of knowledge, the denial of such limitation is implicitly the denial of those

very conditions on which according to Jesus' own testimony the revelation of God as Father to Himself as Son depends. On this point it need only be added that the Fourth Gospel, which lays so great emphasis on the revelation of God in Christ, is as definite as this passage in asserting the communicativeness of the Father, and the receptiveness of the Son as distinctive of their relation.

(3) If we may claim that the centre of the knowledge of Jesus is fixed in this passage, we may also affirm that its circumference is described in the confession of ignorance regarding the time of His return in Matthew xxiv. 36. "But of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only." (Also Mark xiii. 32.) If we look closely at this utterance, we shall surely discover that it expresses surprise. We do not put a strain upon the words greater than they can, or should bear, when we infer from them that it seemed to Jesus wonderful and even bewildering that on a matter that so closely affected Himself the Father, who so freely imparted to Him, should withhold this knowledge from Him. These words are not only a confession of ignorance, but also a confession of the surprise that He felt regarding His ignorance; the passage is thus a double proof of limitation of knowledge. With this saying we may associate the first prayer in Gethsemane in Matthew xxvi. 39. "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." The necessity, if not of His death, yet of the darkness and desolation that He feared in His death, was not absolutely certain to Jesus. In a matter so vitally affecting the fulfilment of His own vocation, He walked by faith, and not by sight; not even the Son, but only the Father knew why the Son must thus, and thus only, fulfil the Father's will. The cry of desolation on the Cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt.

xxvii. 46), bears witness to an interruption, if only momentary, of the revelation of the Father to the Son, due not surely to the cessation of the Father's communicativeness, but to the failure of the Son's receptiveness in the absorption of His mind, heart, and will in His sacrifice, His vicarious experience of the curse of the world's sin.

(4) These passages suffice to prove not only the Son's ignorance, but even His ignorance on matters that seem most closely connected with the revelation and redemption entrusted to Him, and also the necessity of that ignorance to the fulfilment of His vocation, for to omniscience the experiences of Gethsemane and Calvary would have been impossible. Before giving further evidence of the limitation of the knowledge of Jesus, we must pause to remove a difficulty for Christian faith which this recognition of the ignorance of Christ seems to raise. In a subsequent study the effort will be made to show that the whole divine revelation of God and man, sin and salvation, which is essential to human faith radiates from this filial consciousness of Christ as from its luminous centre, so that it possesses the same certainty for us as Christ's assurance that He alone was known by, knew, and made God known. Here it can only be pointed out that the authority of Jesus as regards faith and duty depends, on His own testimony, on the Father's communications to Him as Son. That for the fulfilment of the Son's vocation the Father withheld from the Son some knowledge closely related to that which He imparted does not lessen the meaning or lower the worth of the knowledge given. The authority of Christ relatively to men is not invalidated, because, in accordance with the filial relation, it was relatively to God, derived, dependent, limited, subordinate. We have the assurance of Christ Himself that in the Son the Father is seen and that the Son is the true and living way for men unto the Father (John xiv. 6-9); and that sufficeth us, for that

meets all our moral difficulties and spiritual necessities. The knowledge that the Son possesses and imparts does not include, as some have inferred, all that the Father knows, but only such knowledge as is necessary for filial dependence, submission, communion. This is the principle by means of which we can not only fix the centre, but also describe the circumference of the knowledge of Jesus.

(5) A very brief summary of the other proofs of the limitation of Jesus' knowledge is all that need here be given, as the subject has been fully discussed by Dr. Adamson in *The Mind in Christ*, Chapter I., and by Bishop Gore in *Dissertations: II. The Consciousness of our Lord in His Mortal Life*. He was surprised by His parents' anxiety regarding Him when He was left behind in the Temple (Luke ii. 49). When He visited Nazareth He marvelled at their unbelief (Mark vi. 6). His disciples by their dulness of understanding disappointed Him when they were bewildered by His teaching about outward and inward pollution (Matt. xv. 17) or when they blundered so grievously about His allusion to the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt. xvi. 9-11). He was perplexed by the desire for a sign of His generation (Mark viii. 12). He was filled with glad wonder by the faith of the centurion (Matt. viii. 10), and of the Syro-phœnician woman (Matt. xv. 28). He did not anticipate, though His faith was not disturbed by the storm on the sea of Galilee (Matt. viii. 24); nor was it with intention that He sent His disciples into peril after the feeding of the five thousand (Matt. xiv. 22). He expected to find fruit on the barren fig-tree (Mark xi. 13). He obtained the information He needed and desired by asking questions: "What seek ye?" of the two disciples (John i. 38); "Who touched my garments?" regarding the woman in the crowd (Mark v. 30); "What is thy name?" of the Gadarene demoniac (Luke

viii. 30); "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" of the man born blind (John ix. 35); "Where have ye laid him?" regarding Lazarus' grave (xi. 34); when He wished to know the popular opinion and His disciples' belief regarding Himself He made a direct inquiry (Matt. xvi. 13, 15). It is expressly stated that He developed mentally (Luke ii. 52), and His knowledge of men during His ministry was gained by experience. (John ii. 24, where the verb *γινώσκειν* is used. See Westcott in loco.)

(6) There are recorded in the Gospels some exceptional cases of extraordinary knowledge on the part of Jesus. Some of these instances on closer examination prove to be only apparent. The procuring of the ass for the Triumphal Entry (Matt. xxi. 2-3), and of the upper room for the Last Supper (Mark xiv. 12-16) may be explained by previous arrangement with secret sympathisers, if not disciples, in Jerusalem. The finding of the money in the fish's mouth (Matt. xvii. 27) seems to be an instance of a figurative saying misunderstood, as it would be altogether contrary to the uniform practice of Jesus to perform a miracle of knowledge or of power to meet His own or His disciples' needs. The command of Jesus to His disciples about casting their net for the extraordinary draught of fishes (Luke v. 4) was probably an act of faith in God, even as was the command to the storm (Mark iv. 39). The statement to the woman of Samaria about the number of the husbands she had had (John iv. 17-18) raises a serious difficulty. That the presence of Jesus should disturb the conscience of the woman, and that Jesus should be aware of her discomfort, and should infer its cause is only in accordance with His moral influence and discernment, of which other instances are recorded. But the mention of the number "five" shows a knowledge of a mere fact in the woman's history, to which no exact parallel in the other instances can be produced, for the knowledge of Peter's character (John i. 42)

and of Nathanael's aspirations (verse 48) is explicable as such discernment. The difficulty may be relieved if we remember that there were no other witnesses of the conversation, and that probably the record was derived from the woman herself, who exaggerated in the story she told the people, "He told me all things that ever I did" (iv. 39), and who, therefore, may legitimately be supposed to have blended together the witness of Jesus and the testimony of her guilty conscience. Be this as it may, the instance is too peculiar and solitary to be the basis of any general conclusion regarding the extent of Jesus' ordinary knowledge.

(7) All the other instances are either prophetic anticipations or exercises of moral insight and spiritual discernment. To the former class belong the predictions of His own death and resurrection, of Peter's denial and martyrdom, of Judas' betrayal, and of the fate of Jerusalem. The two last cases must be held over for later consideration. Was not His expectation of death and resurrection bound up with His consciousness of His relation to God, and His vocation for men? The prophecy of Peter's denial, if not altogether explicable by insight into his character, and foresight of the circumstances into which His rashness would probably carry him, is made more intelligible by being connected with this permanent capacity of Jesus. The prediction of Peter's martyrdom is found in the Appendix to John's Gospel (xxi. 18), about which Christian scholarship cannot but cherish some doubts. But even if we accept the record as substantially historical, this prediction proves no more than the prophetic endowment of Jesus. Another instance mentioned by Adamson — "the knowledge of Lazarus' death and resurrection" — may be more apparent than real. The silence of the Fourth Gospel regarding the source of Jesus' knowledge of Lazarus' death does not warrant our assumption of its supernatural character; the confidence that Jesus had that His Father heard Him

always (John xi. 42) explains the certainty with which He foretold the awakening of Lazarus from his sleep. It is doubtful whether the instances of Jesus' knowledge of the character and aspirations of others (as Peter and Nathanael) prove its supernaturalness. His moral perfection and His spiritual transcendence of all mankind would lead us almost inevitably to assume that that sympathetic discernment of the thoughts, feelings, and wishes of others, which is the secret of personal influence, would be developed in Him in the highest possible degree. But even if the knowledge was supernatural, it is no proof of absolute Divine omniscience, but only of divine equipment for His work of dealing with human souls for their salvation.

(8) The previous discussion has not been intended to dim the glory of Jesus as the Christ, but by exhibiting the human limitations under which He fulfilled His vocation to display more clearly its moral and spiritual significance. We must distinguish fact and truth, knowledge and wisdom, the apprehension of fact by knowledge, and the appreciation of truth by wisdom. The one exercises the intellect (observation, memory, conception, inference); the other expresses the whole personality, and implies moral purity as the condition of spiritual vision (Matt. v. 8). There is knowledge that is no evidence of moral excellence or spiritual elevation. But wisdom begins with the fear of God and the departure from iniquity. The saint and the seer even may know very little about the laws of nature or the course of history; and the learned man may be as regards God and the soul a fool. The moral and spiritual perfection of Jesus, the wisdom by which He knew the truth which constitutes the revelation of God in Him, is quite independent of, is not increased or decreased by the extent of His knowledge of facts. On the contrary, as has already been suggested, He could not have fulfilled His vocation without the limitation of His knowledge. That

He might be a high priest "touched with the feeling of our infirmities" it was necessary that He should be "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin"; that He might condemn sin in the flesh, His flesh had to be victorious in temptation over sin; that He might give us an example, He must needs learn obedience by the things that He suffered; to omniscience this entire moral experience and development would have been impossible. Had He shared completely and constantly His Father's omniscience the filial relation of dependence and communion would have been excluded. His agony in Gethsemane and His desolation and darkness on the cross, would never have been, had He not emptied Himself to be limited in knowledge as man.

(9) There are four questions, connected with the extent of the knowledge of Jesus, that press very heavily for answer on Christian thought to-day, on which the conclusion of this discussion throws some light. It used to be taken for granted that Jesus, when He called Judas to discipleship, knew that He would be the betrayer; but such a supposition ought to be intolerable to the Christian conscience. It is morally wrong to place another man in a position that involves not only his possible moral peril, but even his certain moral ruin. Probably, as soon as Judas became estranged, Jesus detected the change, and began to fear the outcome. The statement in John vi. 64, "Jesus knew from the beginning . . . who it was that should betray Him," may mean that the first germs of discontent, distrust, disloyalty in His disciple were discovered by His sympathetic discernment. If the words mean that from the choice of Judas Jesus had this knowledge, moral interests compel us to reject what is but the Evangelist's inference from the knowledge Jesus afterwards displayed. Even when Jesus began to foresee the betrayal, and by warnings and pleadings tried to reach and change the heart of Judas, he was

under no fatal necessity to sin. Like all prophecy Jesus' foresight was conditional. The relation between God's foresight and man's freedom is usually explained by referring to the difference between eternity in which God dwells, and time in which man acts ; but as Jesus was subject to the condition of time, His foresight cannot without intellectual confusion be regarded as absolute as the divine omniscience is, but only as relative. He foresaw what a certain disposition would, under given circumstances, result in, unless either the disposition or the circumstances were changed. It may be that with His deeper moral insight He discovered in Judas a dominance and persistence of evil that made it morally certain that he would not change ; but till the end Judas continued a voluntary agent, on whose liberty Jesus' anticipation put no compulsion. Certainly Jesus did not desire the moral ruin of His unworthy disciple.

(10) Among the miracles wrought by Jesus the most prominent were the cures of persons who were supposed to be possessed by demons. The subject of demonic possession has been investigated by Dr. Alexander, who comes to the conclusion that all the phenomena, except the confession of Jesus as Messiah, can be accounted for naturally as some form of insanity or idiocy. While he insists that "this confession is a residual phenomenon which is not reducible by any means to the purely natural," those who have gone with him so far will be able to take one step more, and maintain that, as the environment in which these insane persons were placed was charged with the excitement stimulated by the current Messianic expectations, they, with less self-control than the sane in the presence of Jesus, said what many others were thinking and feeling. An extravagant belief in angels and demons was characteristic of contemporary Judaism, and any disease which displayed symptoms mysterious to the imperfect

medical knowledge of the age was attributed to demonic possession. As Jesus' references to angels and demons may often be taken as figurative, it is doubtful how far He shared the common belief. His conversation with the Gadarene demoniac, for instance, may be regarded as the wise physician's accommodation to the consciousness of the sufferer, in whom He was seeking to evoke the desire for healing, and the faith that He could heal, which seems to have been in most cases a necessary condition of cure. A comparison of the record in Matthew viii. 28, where Jesus is reported as simply uttering the command "Go," and in Mark v. 13, where the Evangelist himself infers "that he gave them leave," justifies the conclusion that Jesus neither desired nor anticipated the destruction of the swine, for which some other explanation than the narrative suggests must be found. But even if Jesus shared the common belief regarding demonic possession, pathology does not fall within the scope of the divine revelation given in Him, but is an earthly knowledge with which His heavenly wisdom has no direct connexion. Even the belief in angels and demons, in so far as Jesus may have shared it, was received by Him from His temporary and local environment; it is not an essential element in the revelation that He as Son received from the Father; it is never claimed by Him as distinctive of His teaching; it is never required of His disciples as necessary to their faith in Him. In this matter the authority of Jesus forges no fetter, and imposes no burden on the Christian reason and conscience.

(11) The eschatological teaching of Jesus has caused not a little perplexity to many believers. It is certain that He definitely foretold the fall of Jerusalem, and this is an instance of prophetic prediction which is not fully explicable, but is made more intelligible by His insight into the moral and religious condition of His people, and by the political

circumstances of His age. The cursing of the fig tree may be regarded as a prophetic parable; as the people deserved, so the age made probable, a terrible judgment. It is not improbable that the reports of the Evangelists have been coloured by contemporary events. As regards the prophecy of His second coming and the end of the world, it seems impossible altogether to deny the possibility that the authentic sayings of Jesus have been modified and supplemented by the apocalyptic literature current in the Church. Be this as it may, even if the reports are authentic, the characteristics of prophecy are to be looked for in the teaching of Jesus regarding the future. The language is poetical, and not prosaic; the conditions of the present are in some measure necessarily projected into the future age; the perspective is shortened, as the long historical process which separates the starting-point and the goal is ignored. If Jesus confesses ignorance of the time of fulfilment, have we any right to expect from Him exact knowledge of all the circumstances? Consistently with the *kenosis*, could Jesus in the flesh anticipate fully and clearly the conditions of His life and work for the Church in the world after His Resurrection? For would He not thus have walked by sight and not by faith, and would not His filial discipline have been hindered? His claim to supreme authority in earth and heaven, His command to gather all nations into His Church, His promise to be ever present with His followers (Matt. xxviii. 18-20) are surely the post-Resurrection fulfilment of His pre-Resurrection prophecy, and the fulfilment as much transcends the prophecy as Jesus' life, teaching and work transcended the Messianic hope of the Old Testament. The spread of His Gospel, the growth of His Kingdom, the life of His Church, the glory of His Name are His triumphant Advent in, His final judgment, His ultimate salvation of the world. History interprets prophecy; and

as Jesus' knowledge of the future in His earthly life had the characteristics, and was subject to the conditions of prophecy, we may apply to His eschatological teaching the same principles of interpretation. In His own teaching in parables regarding the "mystery of the Kingdom" He Himself anticipated this moral and spiritual process of the fulfilment of His prophecy in Christian history.

(12) Only a few words need now be added in answer to the question stated at the beginning. What the higher criticism is concerned with is facts of date, authorship, literary character, and historical value of the writings which make up the Bible. As regards all these facts Jesus possessed, and gave expression to the knowledge of His age and people, a knowledge which, unless we are prepared to maintain the infallibility of the traditions and conjectures of the Jewish scribes, must be subject to revision and correction, as knowledge in all other departments is, by subsequent investigation. His perfect wisdom was not in any way affected by His imperfect knowledge. The revelation of God as Father was complete without adding anything to human information on this or kindred topics. As the significance and the value of the Old Testament as the literature of divine revelation is unaffected for Christian faith by the answers given to all these questions of fact, it was not at all necessary that Jesus, in confirming and completing this divine revelation, should give a final authoritative answer to any of these questions. His own references to the Old Testament do not lose any of their force or cogency because on these matters He shared the knowledge of His contemporaries. His reference to the Davidic authorship of the 110th Psalm as an *argumentum ad hominem* remains effective, whether David was the author or not (Matt. xxii. 41-45). The significance of His Resurrection does not depend on His allusion to the story of Jonah, even if that be authentic.

(As Matthew xii. 40 does not occur in the parallel account in Luke xi. 29-32, interrupts the course of the argument, and is inaccurate in its reference to the circumstances of the Resurrection, it may be regarded as a later gloss.) It appears then, on close inquiry, that it is not a reverent Christian faith which demands our submission to Christ's authority on these matters, as the evangelical testimony warrants no such demand. It is at the root prejudiced ecclesiastical dogmatism, which knows only the bondage of the letter, and not the freedom of the Spirit; it is a Bibliolatry, such as Christ rebuked in the scribes when He declared, "Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of Me" (John v. 39).

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE REVEALING OF THE TRINITY.

THE purpose of this paper is to suggest, with much diffidence on the part of the writer, a theory as to the principle of Revelation, especially Christian Revelation, which may supply a natural explanation of the various changes through which Christian dogma has passed in the course of the ages.

In the first place, we may note that as in literature, art, and science so in theology it is the supply that creates the demand, and not *vice versa*. The history of inventions, of literature, and of art supply many instances in which a completely original genius strikes out a new line for himself, presents to mankind an idea, a style, a type, a manner hitherto unheard of, and which after passing through the stages of ridicule, of opposition, and toleration becomes eventually universally accepted. It falls to the lot of very few indeed to witness the immediate success of their

ideas. The reception given to Wagner and Browning in their respective spheres is typical of the experience of those who tell their fellows something really new.

Similarly it seems to be one of the conditions or principles of Divine Revelation that the supply of divine truth is in advance of the general demand. A new conception of God's nature or character, or a new application to practical life of knowledge already grasped by the intellect is revealed to one or a few, and they awaken in others the desire for it, until, by slow degrees, the thought or the appeal to conscience permeates through all grades of mind, becoming at last the instinctive conviction of all, a part of the atmosphere of knowledge and morals into which we are born.

The Bible—the narrative of the revelation of God to man—exhibits many illustrations of this phenomenon; but in none is it so clearly and unmistakably marked as in the successive stages of the revelation to man of what is called the Name of God. The Name of God has been defined as “a symbol unveiling His nature” (Liddon), or as “all that has been revealed as to His Person and character” (A. A. Robinson). These definitions are sufficient for our purpose; and, broadly speaking, before Christ came, there had been two revelations given to the chosen people of the Name of God: that of “God Almighty, El Shaddai,” given to Abraham, and that of “Jehovah” given to Moses. What the Fourth Evangelist says in speaking of the revelation given by the Incarnate Son is as true of the ages that had gone before: “No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared Him.” We know now that the first awakening of consciousness in primitive man of the “Power, not himself, that makes for righteousness” was due to the operation of the Personal Logos, Word, or Reason of God, and that from that

Personal Logos proceeded likewise the revelations that are recorded in history, revelations ever growing more and more distinct.

The point, however, on which I desire now to lay emphasis is that the successive revelations of the Name of God usher in epochs of human thought on things divine. They are just in advance of their time, they state the lesson to be learnt by generations following, they do not sum up the conscious experience of the generations preceding; so that we may say that from Abraham to Moses the chosen people were learning by degrees the significance of the covenant name, "God Almighty," and, when they had in some measure grasped that, then from the time of Moses to the end of the old dispensation lawgiver and prophet, psalmist and sage were teaching them the sublime conception of monotheism conveyed in the name "Jehovah"; and it may be added that in like manner has the Christian Church for nearly 1900 years been learning the "name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

We may remark, in passing, that this fact, that the last revelation, until superseded, is always ahead of the thought of humanity, supplies one illustration or example of the divine origin or inspiration of the Bible. It is as with Israel in the Wilderness of the wanderings, when "the ark of the covenant of the Lord went before them three days' journey to seek out a resting place for them." We, to-day, always find the New Testament ahead of us in our advances in things spiritual, moral or social. Our prophets and philanthropists and reformers are constantly proclaiming what, in their conceit, they think to be new commandments, and lo, it is always "an old commandment which we had from the beginning," though we saw it not.

With regard to the matter now under consideration—

the revelation of the doctrine of the Trinity—while the declaration of the Name of God given by our Lord is final, at least so far as this dispensation is concerned, yet the knowledge and apprehension of that Name—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—which the Church has is an ever increasing, an ever widening, an ever deepening one. And this is not merely a case of ordinary growth and advance in knowledge, but is a natural and inevitable result from the relation in which the Church, collectively and individually, stands to the Persons of the Godhead.

The exact wording of Christ's declaration is significant: "Make disciples of all the nations, *baptizing them into the name* of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Baptism, then, is not so much the communication to the soul of a germ of new life, however true that may be, as the incorporation of the personality into a new life, a life all-embracing, vast, ineffable. We "were all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. xii. 13), even "into Christ" (Gal. iii. 27); so "we have become united with Him" (Rom. vi. 5). As members we are brought into the life of the Body; as tendrils or branches we derive our strength from the Vine or Olive into which we have been grafted; as stones our significance and value depend upon the dignity and beauty of that Temple of the living God which collectively we are; as "sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty" we have been adopted into His Family; and we have been made free, as citizens, of the Kingdom of heaven, the rights and privileges of which we jointly, not separately, inherit.

In like manner the revelation of God as Father, Son and Holy Ghost is not a proposition or formula imposed on us from without, by an authority external to ourselves rather is it a spiritual condition, an environment of spiritual existences, a spiritual relationship into which we are brought individually, and as a Church collectively, at our

baptism, and which it is for us to apprehend and profit by according to our spiritual capacities. The case is exactly analogous to what we call the natural life. A child is, at its birth, introduced into the physical life, with all its many and various elements that minister to growth and activity, and is also brought into a more or less complicated social order and intellectual surroundings, and it has to make the best it can of all these physical and social and intellectual conditions of being.

This way of looking at the revelation of divine truth—and indeed all Christian doctrine is summed up in the revelation of the Trinity—seems to afford, if not a solution of many problems, yet a mitigation of some difficulties and misunderstandings. It helps us to understand, on the one hand, why it is that the doctrine of the Trinity means so much more to some men than it does to others, and, on the other hand, inasmuch as the life of the Church is continuous like that of an individual human being, it gives an explanation of the growth and change in the current teaching of the Church from time to time on this particular point of dogma. It is a fact that each generation of thoughtful Christians differs somewhat in its practical treatment of the doctrine from the generation that has gone before. The practical apprehension of the Trinity, like a child's knowledge of its human relationships, grows with the spiritual growth of each individual Christian, and it varies with the varying circumstances of the Church.

Let us speak first of the various presentations of this doctrine by the Church. The life of the Church is not exactly analogous to that of the earthly life of an individual human being. In our life here we pass through the very differing mental characteristics of infancy, childhood, youth, manhood and old age. But it is not so with the Church of Christ; she is, as Hooker says, "a body that dieth not"; and though it be true that she is

ever moving onward "towards the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," yet we instinctively feel that the characteristics of infancy and youth cannot be correctly predicated of the Church of Apostolic times. This paradoxical statement, it is safe to say, could not, with any plausibility, be made of any other institution. But the Church is not a human institution; she partakes of the unending timeless life of Christ whose Body she is; and He "is the same yesterday and to-day, yea and for ever." And so the added centuries by which her life in time is measured bring with them neither decay of vigour, nor decadence of apprehension; and, on the other hand, she had not the weakness or irresponsibility of youth when single years or decades were the units of her duration on earth.

To those who do not believe in the divine origin of the Christian Church this way of speaking will seem not only fanciful but absurd; and yet this way of regarding the Church's life enables us to appreciate properly the varying presentation, by successive generations of Churchmen, of "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." We are hereby guarded from two dangers: firstly, the temptation to regard the views of any one age as the standard of orthodoxy, a golden age of theology towards which the early centuries struggled, and from which later ages have degenerated; and secondly, the temptation—more to be feared in our own day than the other—to depreciate all early theology as being necessarily crude, immature, and unscientific. On the one hand, an appeal to the first four, or any number of, General Councils seems equivalent to saying to the Holy Spirit of God, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further." It is surely an unwise faithlessness that would set bounds to the guiding influence of the Spirit of truth. On the other hand, we must, as Christians, believe that "hitherto hath the Lord helped us," that the promise of Christ has not failed, and that our fathers, no

less than we ourselves, were guided into truth in what they thought and said about the Trinity, as about other things.

What I mean is this: when we pass in review the net results of the conflict of thought of each successive generation of men in the Church, we note something more than so many illustrations of the saying of the Preacher, "He hath made everything beautiful in its time." We observe how questions about the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit rise one after the other for solution, one at a time. Now this aspect of the Name of God, now that seems to monopolize attention, to the exclusion of every other consideration; and looking back, at a long interval, we are able to report progress, we can note something so decided as that the decision of the Church becomes an axiom in the Christian consciousness,¹ we can mark some limits set to our inquiries in this direction or in that, or we can observe some thought material provided for the use of another age of men.

A reference to the language of the New Testament itself will perhaps give an illustration of what has been said. There are some four or five passages in the Epistles in which a knowledge of the revelation of God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit is indicated; e.g., "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all" (2 Cor. xiii. 14; cf. also 1 Cor. xii. 4; Eph. iv. 4-6; 1 Pet. i. 2; Jude 20, 21). Now we are so accustomed to think of the Epistles of the New Testament as material for theological speculation that we forget that, in another point of view, they are the writings of men who, like ourselves, were living in the spiritual environment of the Trinity, in conscious relationship with the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. They differed from us, however, in this, that they seem to have been unaware of the existence of intellectual difficulties in the new Name of

God revealed by Christ. To ask the question, Was St. Paul orthodox on this matter? or St. Peter? or St. Jude? is evidently absurd. Yet if we had not their writings before us, it is doubtful if we, with our intellects rendered suspicious by the controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries, would use the language they do. Nevertheless their words are true words, and the age of the great councils which formulated the doctrine of the Incarnation, precisely and logically, in the language of their time, and for which we thank God, did not close the process of the learning of the Name of God. The subtle questionings of the Middle Ages, the moral struggle of the Reformation, the scientific revolution of the nineteenth century, all stand for so many endeavours, conscious or unconscious, to learn the name of God.

And yet, after all, knowledge, to be of any use, must be such as has profited ourselves personally. The most excellent food will yield no nourishment to him who cannot assimilate it. The armour of Saul may be of the finest brass, but David cannot "go with them" against the Philistine, "for he has not proved them." And so in the Holy War around Mansoul, that which enables a man to stand in the evil day is that knowledge of the Name of God which comes to him from the felt needs of his life. He who really knows God as Father, Redeemer, Sanctifier is well enough, though he might be puzzled to express his faith in the language of the schools.

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST.
MARK.¹

XXXVI. THE THIRD DAY IN JERUSALEM (*continued*).

(f) *The First Commandment*, xii. 28-34. During the previous conversation, a scribe, a Pharisee, had come up and joined the circle of listeners; he had heard with approval the emphatic testimony of Jesus to the doctrine of the resurrection, and had been pleased with the discomfiture of the Sadducees. Now he too was moved to put a question, probably in a curious mood rather than for the sake of posing Jesus or from any serious wish for enlightenment. From his point of view it was a somewhat academic problem: "Which was the first commandment?" e.g., was the commandment about the Sabbath more important than that about duty to parents, or vice versa? Jesus replied in a more serious spirit, dealing with much larger matters; He named as the first commandment a portion of the *Shema*, the profession of faith which pious Jews repeated twice a day.

"Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and soul and mind and strength."²

This ancient word of Revelation—that the essential element in religion was the right and harmonious relation of the whole nature of man to God—had been set upon a pinnacle above all other ordinances by Pharisaic Judaism, and Jesus endorsed this judgment. Nothing, therefore, could be more orthodox than such an answer. Unfortunately the daily repetition of the *Shema* had not always prevented the Pharisees from setting the Sabbath, ceremonial clean-

¹ These studies do not profess to be an adequate historical and doctrinal account of Christ, but are an attempt to set forth the impression which St. Mark's account of our Lord would make on a reader whose only source of information was the Second Gospel, and who knew nothing of Christian dogmatics.

² Deut. vi. 4.

ness, and other matters of ritual above honesty and justice, kindness, generosity, and natural affection; therefore Jesus added :

“The second is this, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.’¹ There is no other commandment greater than these.”

Thus this last inquirer, in his turn, had been met by an answer beyond criticism; but he was a more appreciative hearer than his predecessors; he did not receive the words in baffled silence, but welcomed them with cordial approval.

“A good answer, teacher; you have said with truth that He is one, and there is none beside Him, and to love Him with the whole heart and intellect and strength, and to love one’s neighbour as oneself is much more than all burnt offerings and sacrifices.”

Jesus had rarely found any one to understand Him so promptly and so thoroughly, and this intelligent sympathy was welcome to His lonely and burdened spirit.

“Thou art not far,” He said, “from the Kingdom of God.” The answer to this scribe brought to an end the heckling to which Jesus had been subjected; the enemies who had sought to entangle Him in His speech had retired in shame and confusion, and now no one dared ask Him any more questions.

(g) *Jesus asks a question in His turn, xii. 35–37.* Having repulsed these attacks, Jesus took the offensive and assailed His opponents with a question of His own.

“How is it that the scribes say that the Messiah is David’s son? David himself said by the Holy Spirit, ‘The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand until I put thine enemies under thy feet.’² David himself calls the Messiah ‘Lord,’ how then is the Messiah David’s son?”

No one replied; indeed, Jesus did not expect an answer; His words were a rhetorical challenge and not a demand for a reply from any particular individuals.

¹ Leviticus xix.

² Psalm cx.

The point of the challenge is not clear, but obviously some teaching of the scribes is attacked; for they were the authorities on Theology and the Scriptures, and were naturally appealed to as to the bearing of a passage of a Psalm on the doctrine of the Messiah. As the question was a counterstroke to the interrogations to which Jesus had been subjected we should naturally seek some light from the narrative of the previous incidents. The priests had attacked His authority as a religious leader; the Sadducees His knowledge and insight as a doctrinal teacher; both implied that He was an impostor, a pseudo-Christ. Again, the question put by the allied Herodians and Pharisees was intended to imperil Jesus' position by bringing Him into collision either with the populace or the Romans, Jesus' counter-question may have been equally concerned with the practical politics of the situation; it discusses one of the characteristic notes of Messiahship, and the thought must, at any rate, have passed through the minds both of Jesus and His hearers, "Did He possess this note? Was He David's son?" If we follow up this suggestion, it would seem that the scribes had brought forward the doctrine that the Messiah must be descended from David as an objection to the claims of Jesus; but the doctrine of Davidic descent could only be an objection, if it was supposed that Jesus was not descended from David, and if Jesus and His family and followers were ignorant of any such descent. As far as our present Gospel is concerned, Jesus never speaks of Himself, nor does St. Mark speak of Him, as the son of David; the only person who calls Him, "Son of David" is Bartimaeus, and in his mouth it is a mere Messianic title, and not a statement of knowledge of physical descent from David. According to this suggestion Jesus' question would imply that the absence of Davidic descent was not a valid objection, because the scribes, theory of the Davidic descent of the Messiah was incon-

sistent with the teaching of the Bible as interpreted by the scribes themselves.

Again the Sadducees had sought to discredit Jesus as a teacher; probably too His last interrogator, the scribe, was partly actuated by a desire to test the claims of the Galilaean prophet. Possibly Jesus was now seeking to discredit His adversaries the scribes as authoritative exponents of the national faith. It was on their authority, as the Biblical experts of their times, that Psalm cx. was accepted as Davidic; that Davidic descent was held to be necessary for the Messiah; and that the "Lord" of Psalm cx. was interpreted to mean the Messiah. Hence the incompatibility of these views showed the incompetence of those who taught them. According to this view Jesus need not have had any answer in His mind; His point would have been that the scribes were incompetent, because it was impossible for them to find an answer.

Another alternative might possibly be suggested by the question of the scribe—that Jesus was merely raising an academic question from motives of curiosity; but such a view is quite inconsistent with His character.

(h) *Denunciation of the scribes, xii. 38-40.* The question was not answered, and Jesus pushed His attack in a more direct fashion; He charged the scribes, that is to say, the Pharisees, with being possessed by sordid vanity, a mean craving for trivial social distinctions; they were greedy and grasping, and given to an ostentatious display of unreal unction.

"Beware of the scribes that love official robes to walk in, salutations in the market places, and seats of honour in synagogues and at feasts; that eat widows out of house and home, and pray ostentatiously at great length."

These men were popularly regarded as models of zeal, piety, and holiness, and as authorities on faith and practice; but according to Jesus they deserved, and would receive, the severest condemnation.

(i) *The Widow's Mite*, xii. 41-44. Sometimes, in these last days, Jesus withdrew from the labour of teaching and the jar of controversy. One one occasion He sat a little apart from His disciples over against the offertory boxes of the Temple treasury, and watched the worshippers putting in their contributions. His interference with the festival Fair in the Temple courts had not destroyed confidence in the maintenance of public order; in other respects things went on as usual, and the gifts were many and liberal. Jesus sat and watched. It seems that, on the modern principle of subscription lists and open offertory plates, the arrangements were such that the bystander could see the amount of each offering. One after another richly dressed men of dignified bearing came up placing large gifts in the boxes, and passed on. Some perhaps noticed the observant prophet and went away with a pleased feeling that he would be favourably impressed with their generosity. Other worshippers made their offerings; at last one of them specially attracted the attention of Jesus; a woman poorly dressed in the garb of a widow threw in two brass coins of small value and went on her way like the rest. Something in her manner, a note of radiance, a touch of exaltation inspired by a great sacrifice, betrayed her secret to the Seer who watched her. He called His disciples to Him and said to them:

“Verily I say unto you, that this poor widow has cast in more than all they that are casting into the treasury; for they all cast in of their superfluity, but she of her want cast in all that she had, even all her living.”

Here St. Mark's record of the public ministry of Jesus closes. Let us look for a moment at these last days from the point of view of the opponents of Jesus, of the people of Jerusalem, of the disciples and of Jesus Himself. His

public appearance as Messiah and His assumption of control over the Temple had added the Jewish officials to the number of His active enemies. Nevertheless He had more than held His own; yet He had gained nothing but Pyrrhic victories; His assailants were only baffled for the moment, and their temporary discomfiture intensified their hostility. So far, however, they were perplexed by His failure to make practical use of His influence over the people and by His mysterious hint as to His coming death.

In the same way the populace of Jerusalem were puzzled by the Galilean prophet, who seemed to unite in Himself so much that was contradictory. On the one hand, He had been declared the Messiah, and indeed He was in many ways most remarkable; His personality was both winsome and commanding, and He had a most attractive eloquence, to which they listened with much enjoyment. And yet in other ways, He seemed to have nothing Messiah-like about Him. He had a great reputation for miracles, but He wrought none in Jerusalem; He had successfully asserted His authority over the Temple, but He had taken no further steps to make Himself master of the city; there was no sign of His being the Warrior-King who was to drive out the Romans and establish the Kingdom of God in Israel.

Most of all the disciples were bewildered by the apparent inconsistencies of Jesus; sometimes His popularity and His triumphs over His opponents excited exultant anticipations of the immediate coming of the Kingdom; at other times their hearts were sick with hope deferred, and His gloomy forebodings of impending doom filled them with vague apprehensions.

And Jesus Himself? He was not conscious of any inconsistency, for in simple, straightforward fashion He fulfilled his duties, and used His opportunities as they came. He knew that the end was both near and certain, and the knowledge isolated Him more than ever from the ordinary

concerns of life and even from His disciples. It was a time of suspense, of waiting for a blow without knowing when it would come, yet with the assurance that it might fall at any moment, and that it could not be long delayed. He was like a man sentenced to death, but not knowing the day of His execution. He might contemplate mundane affairs with a certain detachment, and watch the bickerings of Pharisee and Sadducee, priest, scribe, and centurion with the serene interest of a stranger studying the politics of a foreign capital. Jerusalem and its people would seem dim and shadowy, and the Kingdom of God the only true reality.

Yet one day passed after another, and the blow did not fall, and He remained alive, at liberty, and a great power among the people. The strained and overwrought situation might become familiar and seem normal and capable of being indefinitely prolonged. The natural vitality of a vigorous man in his prime would instinctively protest against acquiescence in death and suggest renewed hopes and a happier issue. He retained an unshaken confidence that the Kingdom of God would come through Himself, but He might sometimes doubt whether His anticipations of death and resurrection were to be accepted literally; there might after all be some less rugged path to the assured end.

Meanwhile all concerned expected a crisis at the Pass-over; friends and foes alike would suppose that Jesus was planning some decisive step on the great day of the feast; and on the other hand the priests would feel it an urgent necessity to regain control of the Temple courts before the festival actually began; and Jesus Himself might expect some clear indication of the will of God at that sacred season.

W. H. BENNETT.

THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF ST. PAUL.

(9) CASES OF CONSCIENCE.

THE entry of a religion like Christianity into a world like that of the Roman Empire led inevitably, in the minds of those who received it, to many grave practical problems which demanded all the patience and sagacity of the Apostles for their solution. The life of the Christian disciple had indeed undergone a marvellous transformation, a transformation so great that all the familiar metaphors of change—from bondage to liberty, from darkness to light, from death to life—are exhausted in describing it. Yet in many ways the old life went on as before, with little or nothing to mark the beginning of the new order. Converts to Christianity remained in the same homes, in the same city, with the same neighbours, at the same occupations, eating and drinking, buying and selling, marrying and giving in marriage, as in the days that were past. Indeed, it was this very intimacy between the new present and the old past that thrust into sharper prominence the questions that immediately began to arise: How ought a Christian slave to act towards a heathen master? If a dispute arose between Christian men, how was it to be settled? must the disputants carry the case before a heathen tribunal? If a wife became a Christian, must she separate herself from an unbelieving husband? And, especially, what ought a man to do when, by partaking, in the social intercourse of daily life, of meat that had been offered in sacrifice to idols, he found himself in danger of appearing to countenance the very idolatry with which his faith was at war? Questions of this kind—questions, i.e., not of absolute right or wrong, but of moral expediency—would be answered very differently even by Christian men, according as they understood,

or partially understood, or altogether misunderstood, the true genius of Christianity. Then from these differing judgments, and the differing lines of conduct consequent upon them, it would be but a little way to that ugly censoriousness with which in every age of the Church some of the servants of Christ have always been ready to visit any departure from their own standards of right and wrong. Such in point of fact the New Testament shows to have been the case in several of the Churches founded by St. Paul. We may take as examples the Church at Rome and the Church at Corinth.

In Rome, as we learn from the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters of the Epistle to the Church in that city, there were some (probably a small minority in the Church) who judged it right to mark certain days by special observances (xiv. 5), and to abstain wholly from the use both of meat and wine (xiv. 2, 21). Others made light of such scruples; they had faith to eat all things; they esteemed every day alike. Thus there arose the two parties to which the Epistle makes reference—the weak and the strong. Had they been wise enough and Christian enough to respect each other's position and to show mutual forbearance, nothing further need have been heard of the matter; for differences of the kind referred to are likely to continue while the world lasts. Unhappily, both sides showed themselves at fault; the strong held the weak in derision; the weak passed judgment on the strong, or, in the face of a protesting conscience, went over to their side and so brought darkness and death into their own souls.

At Corinth the question, though similar in principle, was different in origin.¹ The opposing parties bore the same name as in the Roman Church, but in this case the weak

¹ See 1 Cor. viii.-x. I have not thought it necessary to discuss the origin of the scruples of the Roman Christians. A useful note on the subject will be found in Sanday and Headlam's Commentary, p. 399.

were not vegetarians; their scruples had to do only with the eating of meat which had been offered in sacrifice to idols. To eat of such meat—and in a city like Corinth it was not easy to avoid doing so—was in their eyes to partake of the sin and guilt of idolatry. “Not so,” rejoined the strong; “an idol is nothing; there is no God but one; why then, should we not eat?” And here, as at Rome, the liberty of the strong was in danger of becoming a stumbling-block to the weak, “the brethren for whose sake Christ died.”

In each case St. Paul deals with the question at length, and in such a manner as to lift the whole discussion out of the region of the local and temporal into that of the universal and abiding. In themselves the questions discussed have no interest for us to-day whatsoever; they are as remote from our modern life as any of the dead and buried controversies of the past. Yet such is the Apostle’s treatment of them that these chapters in the Roman and Corinthian Epistles still speak to us with authority, still lay upon us warm, compelling hands of life and power. It will be our endeavour now to gather up some of the chief ethical principles which emerge in the course of this twofold discussion.

I

To the weak St. Paul says that their scruples are a mistake, but that nevertheless, until conscience is sufficiently enlightened to get rid of them, they have no alternative but to respect them.

That the Apostle’s judgment was wholly with the strong his language in both Epistles makes abundantly plain. “We that are strong,” he writes,¹ thus openly associating himself with one of the parties in the dispute. “We know,” he says, “that no idol is anything in the world, and that there is no

¹ Rom. xv. 1.

God but one”¹; and therefore “all things are clean.”² “I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself.”³ “Meat will not commend us to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse; nor, if we eat, are we the better.”⁴ “Blessed,” he exclaims, “is he whose conscience is unvexed by scruples.”⁵ But he whose conscience will not suffer him to eat meat is weak, weak in faith; in other words, “he does not fully appreciate what his Christianity means; in particular, he does not see that the soul which has committed itself to Christ for salvation is emancipated from all law but that which is involved in its responsibility to Him.”⁶

Nevertheless, though a man may be conscientious and yet be in the wrong, his conscience, weak and uninstructed as it is, must still be obeyed. Enlightenment can never come by disobedience. The passages just quoted which vindicate the theory of the strong are in almost every case completed by words which justify, and indeed necessitate, the abstinence of the weak, so long as they remain weak. “We know,” says St. Paul, “that there is no God but one . . . howbeit, in all men there is not that knowledge,”⁷ and therefore, he means, not the same liberty of action. “All things indeed are clean: howbeit it is evil for that man who eateth with offence.” “Nothing is unclean of itself; save that to him who accounteth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean.” What is needful is that “each man be fully assured in his own mind,” for “he that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; and whatsoever is not of faith is sin.”⁸

¹ 1 Cor. viii. 4.

² Rom. xiv. 20.

³ Rom. xiv. 14.

⁴ 1 Cor. viii. 8.

⁵ Rom. xiv. 22.

⁶ Denney, *Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. ii., p. 700.

⁷ 1 Cor. viii. 4-7.

⁸ Rom. xiv. 20, 14, 5, 23.

We have here the enunciation of a twofold moral principle of the highest practical importance. On the one hand the Apostle makes it plain that over-scrupulousness, so far from being a virtue to be proud of, is rather a weakness to be got rid of; it is a sign of little faith and of an imperfect understanding of the meaning of Christianity. "Fatty degeneration of the conscience," as it has been wittily called,¹ is an ailment to which a certain type of religious persons is peculiarly liable, and there is nothing which they more need to be assured of than that an "enlarged" conscience is as certainly a sign of bad moral health as an "enlarged" heart is of bad physical health. So long as they regard their super-sensitiveness with Pharisaic self-complacency there is small hope of their cure. On the other hand, St. Paul asserts unhesitatingly the supremacy even of the weak conscience. If it is at fault, it must be enlightened; but enlightened or unenlightened, it must be obeyed. It may be, it often is, an ignorant and blundering guide; yet it is the best a man has, and he must submit himself to it. The path of obedience is always the path of growing light, but to disobey is to turn our feet and our face towards that night in which the light that is within us is become darkness. "May we not," says Newman, "look for a blessing *through* obedience even to an erroneous system, and a guidance even by means of it out of it? Were those who were strict and conscientious in their Judaism, or those who were lukewarm and sceptical, more likely to be led into Christianity, when Christ came? . . . I have always contended that obedience even to an erring conscience was the way to gain light, and that it mattered not where a man began, so that he began on what came to hand, and in faith."² And such also is the contention of St. Paul. He

¹ The phrase occurs in that clever book *Isabel Carnaby*, but it was used several years before by a writer in the *Spectator* (Dec. 26, 1891).

² *Apologia*, p. 206.

is sure that the scruples of the weak are mistaken; he is equally sure that it is at their souls' peril they do violence to them. It may seem a hard saying, yet it is justified by experience. A wounded conscience who can bear? It is able, as Thomas Fuller says, to unparadise Paradise itself. "Others persuaded," writes Archbishop Laud in his diary, "but my own conscience loudly forbade me . . . Ah! how much better had I suffered [martyrdom with Thy proto-martyr upon his commemoration day, than done the pleasure of too faithless, careless friends . . . I am not stoned for my sins but stoned by them."¹ But there is a worse penalty of disobedience than the agony of remorse; by disobedience conscience may be stifled, it may be silenced, it may be slain. "'It is one thing to have a conscience,' answered Agellius, 'another thing to act upon it. The conscience of these poor people is darkened. You had a conscience once.' 'Conscience, conscience,' said Juba. 'Yes, certainly, once I had a conscience. Yes, and once I had a bad chill, and went about chattering and shivering; and once I had a game leg, and then I went limping; and so, you see, I once on a time had a conscience. O yes, I have had many consciences before now, white, black, yellow, and green; they were all bad; but they are all gone, and now I have none.'"² That is what comes in the end of treating conscience as an irksome monitor to be silenced and got rid of at the first opportunity.

II.

From the weak St. Paul turns to the strong; it is with them he is chiefly concerned; it is to them most of his counsels are addressed. As we have seen, he admits un-

¹ See Mozley's *Essays Historical and Theological*, vol. i. p. 146. The sin to which the extract refers was the marriage by Laud, when a young clergyman, of a woman who had been divorced.

² Newman's *Callista*, ch. iv.

hesitatingly the rightness of their main contention ; in matters of meat and drink they were under a law of liberty ; they were not wrong, they were right, when they insisted that the watchword, " all things are lawful," which was so often upon their lips, and which probably they had learned from his, did apply in cases such as these. They were wrong when they made this saying to be the conclusion of the whole matter. Christian liberty is indeed a great thing, to be fought for if need be to the last ; but liberty to whose exercise prudence and charity set no limits quickly ceases to be Christian. " All things are lawful for me," says St. Paul, " but not all things are expedient." And if a thing be not expedient, then, for me, the Apostle means, neither is it lawful ; my liberty is so far limited. This expediency is of two kinds :

(1) Expediency in our own interests : " All things are lawful for me ; but I will not be brought under the power of any." ¹

(2) Expediency in the interests of others : " All things are lawful ; but all things edify not." ²

On the first of these sayings St. Paul does not dwell and it is not necessary to dwell here. It sets forth what may be called the common sense of the matter : " such and such a thing is in my power ; I will take care that it does not get me into its power. I will never by abuse of my liberty forfeit that liberty in its noblest part." ³ Lawful things are unlawful to those who cannot use them lawfully ; and the moment any indulgence, however innocent in itself, threatens to gain the upper hand, and the slave to sit in the master's seat, it is time to assert oneself and to

¹ 1 Cor. vi. 12.

² 1 Cor. x. 23.

³ Findlay, *Expositor's Greek Testament*, p. 818. An admirable exposition of the whole subject may be found by the same writer in an article entitled " Law, Liberty, and Expediency," in the *Monthly Interpreter*, vol. i. p. 292.

say plainly, "I will not be brought under the power of any." "Enjoying things which are pleasant; that is not an evil: it is the reducing of our moral self to slavery by them that is. Let a man assert withal that he is king over his habitudes; that he could and would shake them off, on cause shown; this is an excellent law."¹ And this is the first of the laws by which St. Paul fences about the law of liberty.

Of expediency in the interests of others St. Paul has many things to say, or rather he has one thing to say and he says it many times: great is liberty and greatly to be praised, but greater is love, and in the presence of love liberty must bow her head and moderate her claims. This is the burden of his message in all that he writes to the strong, whether at Corinth or Rome: "Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to the weak."² He knows better than they do all that can be urged in their behalf; he sees more clearly than they can the foolishness of the scruples of the weak, but he will be a victim to no theory, his own or other men's. St. Paul lived in a real world, with his feet well planted on the solid earth, and he never forgot that in a world like ours a man's duty has to be determined, not by abstract reasonings concerning rights and liberty, but by the actual circumstances in the midst of which he lives, and by the consequences, possible or probable, of his conduct amid those circumstances. We are not so many Robinson Crusoes living our own self-centred lives, remote from all the rest of the world; we are bound up with each other in the bundle of life; we are members one of another, so that if one member suffer all the members suffer with it. And for such men in such a world the Apostle lays down one of the first conditions of united well-being when

¹ Carlyle's *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, Lect. 2.

² 1 Cor. viii. 9.

he says, "Let no man seek his own but each his neighbour's good"; "Let no man be a stumbling-block in his brother's way or an occasion of falling"; "Let us follow after things which make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another."¹ Nor does he hesitate to press the application of the principle to its utmost limits; the strong must sacrifice anything rather than that the weak should perish: "If because of meat thy brother is grieved, thou walkest no longer in love . . . it is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth."² And in so saying St. Paul lays no heavier yoke on the shoulders of others than he gladly wears himself: "Give no occasion of stumbling, either to Jews, or to Greeks, or to the church of God; even as I also please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of the many, that they may be saved."³ "If meat maketh my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore, that I make not my brother to stumble."⁴

But, it may be asked, is not this to press too heavily upon the forbearance of the strong? Do the scruples of the weak deserve such tender consideration? Would it not be better, in the interests of the weak themselves, to stand up to them boldly and tell them plainly that they are in the wrong? Sometimes, doubtless; it must be remembered, however, that St. Paul is dealing with a case in which the exercise of the liberty of the strong is known to end in the emboldenment, though not the enlightenment, of the conscience of the weak, and to be, therefore, an occasion of falling. And in such a case, St. Paul declares, a Christian man has no alternative—he must

¹ 1 Cor. x. 24; Rom. xiv. 13, 19.

² Rom. xiv. 15, 21.

³ 1 Cor. x. 32, 33.

⁴ 1 Cor. viii. 13.

renounce his freedom; the cheques which law has signed he cannot honour until they are counter-signed by the hand of love. To this conclusion the Apostle was led and held by a threefold motive: the peace of the Church, the claims of brotherhood, and the sacrifice of Christ.

The feeling for the Church was always much stronger in St. Paul than it is in many of his disciples to-day, and it was well-nigh inevitable that in a discussion of this character the ideal of mutual upbuilding¹ should sooner or later come into sight. The Christian belongs to a community, so that his life is not simply his own private affair; it is a part of the life of the community to which he belongs, and in which he has power both for building up and casting down. It is to this that St. Paul refers when he writes, "Let us follow after things whereby we may edify one another. Overthrow not for meat's sake the work of God."² The tie of obligation is tightened still further when the Apostle reminds the strong that they for whom he pleads are their brethren. They may be ignorant and foolish, but this claim at least they have—they are not strangers and aliens, they are fellow-citizens, children of the same household, cared for by the same Divine love. "If meat maketh my *brother* to stumble"—when the matter stands thus how can a man hesitate?³ Moreover, did not Christ die for "the weak brother," even as for all others, and shall we refuse the sacrifice of meat or drink for one for whom He spared not His own life? "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves, . . . for Christ also pleased not Himself." This is the supreme motive, and

¹ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας (Rom. xiv. 19).

² Rom. xiv. 19, 20.

³ It is worthy of note that the word "brother" (or its plural) occurs five times in Rom. xiv., and four times in the parallel chapters in 1 Cor.

for every man whose heart lies open to its appeal the conclusion of the whole matter.

III.

Our exposition may close with St. Paul's warning against judging addressed to the weak and strong alike. "Thou," he writes to the weak, "why dost thou judge thy brother"? "or thou again"—and here he turns to the strong—"why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God. For it is written,

As I live, saith the Lord, to me every knee shall bow,
And every tongue shall confess to God.

So then each one of us shall give account of Himself to God. Let us not therefore judge one another any more."¹

The temptation of the weak is to censoriousness, the temptation of the strong to contemptuousness. He whose conscience holds him with a tight rein often judges unjustly the larger liberty which others feel themselves free to enjoy; their inability to condemn what in his eyes is so plainly wrong he attributes to moral blindness. On the other hand, liberal-mindedness, in defiance of its own principles, often breeds contempt; it will see in the scruples of those who look at life with other, and perhaps smaller, eyes only a broad target for the shafts of scorn. And in so doing, St. Paul says, the weak and strong are equally at fault, and for the same reason: "For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God . . . each one of us shall give account of himself to God." That is to say, our responsibility for our life—for our narrowness and our breadth, for our scruples and our freedom—is not to each other, but to God. Who art thou that judgest the servant of another? to his own lord he standeth or falleth.

¹ Rom. xiv. 10-13. See also *vv.* 3 and 4.

The habit of judging is to be condemned on many grounds, but this surely is the head and front of its offending: it is an irrelevance and an impertinence, an invasion of the Divine prerogative. The Father hath committed all judgment to the Son, and who are we that we should seek to share His judgment-throne with Him? Of what use is the multitude of our hasty ill-informed judgments since He is to revise them and Himself to judge us all? "Blessed," it is written, "are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy"; but they to whom, in the white dawn of the Judgment Day, God will find it hardest to show mercy, will they not be those who have sought to take the work of judgment out of His hands, and in haste and bitterness have condemned their fellow-men? Our judgments God will judge; and is there one amongst us who will not have upon his head at that last great day sins many enough and heavy enough and black enough to answer for that he must needs add to them this sin also? Wherefore let us set a watch before our mouths, let us keep the door of our lips, and let us not judge one another any more.

GEORGE JACKSON.

ICONIUM.¹

III. THE TERRITORY OF ICONIUM.

ICONIUM commanded and formed the centre of a very wide territory. The plain that stretches away to north and east and south was Iconian soil to a great distance from the city. On the south the territory of Iconium bordered on Lystra, among the outer Isaurian hills. The natural features suggest, and Ptolemy is in agreement, that the territory which belonged to Lystra did not extend into the plain (though Lystra was a Lycaonian city).

On the south-east, beyond all doubt, Iconian soil stretched nearly as far as Kara-Dagh, fourteen hours away. On the north-east it reached almost certainly to Boz-Dagh, which divided it from northern Lycaonia, a half-Phrygian, half-Lycaonian district. On the west and north the bounds are not so clearly marked by nature. Iconian territory on that side extended some distance into the mountainous or hilly region which for the most part belonged to the Orondians. Probably the basins of the small streams which flowed into the Iconian plain were included in Iconian territory; and on this principle the limit between Orondian territory and Lycaonian (i.e. Iconian) has been marked in the map attached to my article on Lycaonia already quoted.² The north-east part

¹ In footnote 1 on p. 211 of last number of the *Expositor*, I mentioned an inscription with the name Claudiconium used of the Colonia, which I was unable to find: it is, as I have since observed, published by my friend Rev. H. S. Cronin in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1902, p. 123. It is the epitaph of Q. Ebureus Maximus, high priest of the Gods-Emperors, probably Aurelius and Verus 161-166 A.D. In popular usage, therefore, the old name Claudiconium survived in some rare cases for a time after the Colonia was founded, but it was never used in any official document or coin known to us. Even private documents ordinarily call the colony Iconium, see examples Cronin, l.c. (same page), and Sterrett, *Epigraphic Journey*, No. 254.

² *Oest. Jahreshefte*, 1904, *Beiblatt*, p. 67 f.

of this hilly region, lying between Iconium and Laodiceia the Burnt (the reason for whose peculiar name has hitherto been entirely unknown),¹ seems to have formed part of a great estate belonging to the Roman Emperors. That estate was originally the property of the Great Goddess, the Zizimmene Mother, or Mother of Gods, already mentioned in § I. As was the case at all the great sanctuaries of Asia Minor, the Mother of Zizima was mistress of the lands around her chosen home; and the people were her servants, the slaves of the sanctuary. During the Roman period the mines and the lands of Zizima became Imperial property, and were managed for the benefit of the Emperor's private purse by his own personal agents, his slaves and his freedmen. The goddess had originally been more closely connected with Iconium, if we may judge from the number of dedications found in that city; but under the Romans the mines were managed from Laodiceia, as is shown by the large proportion of Imperial slaves and freedmen who are mentioned in the inscriptions found there.²

It was usual that the management of such a property should be centred in a city, and not in the rural surroundings amid which it was situated. Thus, for example, Phrygian marble quarries (which likewise were Imperial property) were managed, not from the quarries, nor even from the neighbouring city Dokimion, but from the more important city of Synnada, nearly thirty miles to the south. That is proved both by the numerous references to the personal agents of the Emperor in the inscriptions of Synnada, and from the fact that the Phrygian marble was known all over the world as Synnadic, because people heard of it as connected with and managed at Synnada, and orders for it

¹ The explanation of the epithet "Burnt" is given below. It was discovered only after this paragraph was written.

² In the *Classical Review*, Oct. 1905, there will be published a paper in which the evidence bearing on the mines is collected.

were executed there. Only in the home country was the marble known as Dokimian. The deciding reason for this close relation to Synnada indubitably was that Synnada lay on the road from the quarries to Rome, while Dokimion lay in the opposite direction ; and if the marble blocks had been carried first to Dokimion, they would have had to be transported afterwards back past the quarries to Synnada on their way to Rome.

Now, though Iconium was in some respects a greater city than Burnt Laodiceia, and probably more intimately connected with Zizima in primitive time, yet Laodiceia was marked out as the natural seat of management for the Roman estates ; it was on the great Trade Route leading to Ephesus and Rome ; it was closer to Zizima than Iconium was ; and it lay between Zizima and Rome. Had the ore been brought from Zizima to Iconium, it would have had to be carried from Iconium to Laodiceia on its way to Rome. Roman convenience dictated the arrangements in both cases.

This is a typical example of the great principle that Rome was the centre of the world in that period, and that everything was arranged with a view to ease of communication with "the great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth"—as "she sitteth upon the seven mountains"—her by whom "the merchants of all things that were dainty and sumptuous were made rich" (Rev. xviii. 14), "the great city wherein were made rich all that had their ships in the sea by reason of her costliness," and whose "merchants were the princes of the earth"—the one centre to which flowed all trade and all produce of the earth—over whose destruction "the merchants of the earth were in the end to weep and mourn, for no man buyeth their merchandise any more," to whom resorted all the kings of the earth, and all the wealthy, to enjoy her amusements and be corrupted by her vices (Rev. xvii. 2, xviii. 3). In the list

of wares which the merchants carried to the great city (Rev. xviii. 12 f.) we recognize the produce of the mines of Zizima in the "scarlet," for the cinnabar which was exported from the remote village among the mountains was the vermilion pigment widely used in the Roman world; and the "Burnt Laodiceia" got its name and fame in the Roman world from the smelting establishments where the pigment was prepared "by triturating mercury and sulphur together, and heating the black sulphide (chemically termed HgS) until it sublimes." The ore of Zizima was the native mercuric sulphide, HgS . The name "Burnt," by which the city was distinguished from the many other cities called Laodiceia, becomes full of meaning when we remember that this Laodiceia was the managing centre of the mining trade of Zizima, and that the ore was treated by roasting either at the city or in its territory. The furnaces were a sight striking to the ancient mind, and the city became known far and wide, wherever the trade in cinnabar was heard of, as Burnt Laodiceia. This hitherto obscure epithet reveals to us an important fact of ancient Lycaonian society and trade.

The same epithet "Burnt" (Katakekaumene) is applied to a district of Lydia, on account of its scarred and blackened appearance, due to volcanic action proceeding from craters which have become extinct in comparatively recent time; and it is likely to have had a similar origin in the appearance presented by the city or the neighbourhood. The idea that the name was derived from a conflagration which destroyed the city rests on no authority, and is merely a modern inference from the epithet "Burnt." The character imparted to the landscape by several large furnaces may be seen (on a much greater scale) in various places at the present day. The ancients were interested in the appearance imparted by fumes and fire; for example, a recipe is given in a Greek Magic papyrus now in the

British Museum, "to make brass things appear gold"¹; the method recommended is obscure, but it involved the use of native sulphur, the fumes of which impart a richer yellow tinge to brass.

The land of Iconium was extremely fertile, and highly cultivated by irrigation. Those Lycaonian plains, in great part composed of rich and stoneless soil, are dependent for high produce on irrigation. The spring rains, which are generally abundant and make even June a very uncertain month in respect of weather, are in most years sufficient for a certain amount of cultivation—much wider than at the present day. But the crops produced by irrigation are more abundant, far more certain as being independent of the varying rainfall, and more extensive. A large body of water is poured into the plain by several streams. It is at present for the most part dissipated or left to stagnate in marshes; but in ancient times the supply was (as we have seen in § I.) much larger, more regular, and properly distributed by irrigation.

Strabo contrasts the barrenness of the Lycaonian plains in general with the productiveness and wealth of the Iconian territory; and the only possible reason for the difference, when the soil is similar, lies in the irrigation, which was wanting in the one case, and applied in the other. An indication of the abundant artificial supply of water in the Iconian plain is disclosed in the narrative of the German crusade in 1190, led by the famous Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. When he marched from Iconium towards the south, he spent the second night at a village called Forty Fountains. Now there are no natural springs in the Iconian territory. After careful questioning of many informants, I could not learn of the existence of any natural fountain in the plain, except a small one under the western edge of Kara-Dagh. On or near the line of

¹ *Greek Papyri of Brit. Mus.* i. p. 89.

Barbarossa's march there is no spring; but the village to which his second day's march would bring him was not far from the natural course of the stream that flows from Lystra into the Iconian plain. The Forty Fountains must have been artificial, supplied from the Lystra water, which is still used in a similar way, partly for irrigation, partly to supply the large village of Ali-Bey-Eyuk¹; and Forty Fountains must have been at or a little north of that village. The modern village, which takes its name from a large tumulus (eyuk), "the mound of Ali-Bey," close beside it, is indubitably the site of an ancient village.

The population of this widely stretching Iconian land—at least 200 square miles in extent, probably considerably more—was, of course, not entirely concentrated in the central town. To the ancients the city was not merely the circle of the walls, but the entire state of Iconium, with all its territory and the dwellers on it. We have just given an example of one village, Forty Fountains. Another was situated about twelve miles further to the south-east, some distance beyond the river Tcharshamba, beside a poor modern khan, halfway between Konia and Laranda. This village must have been not far from the extreme southern limit of Iconian soil. Except for the khan, the place is now entirely deserted. Another Iconian village was situated on the road that led due south to Nova Isaura (Dorla, forty miles from Iconium), about a mile west of the modern Tcharyklar, fifteen miles from Iconium, and a village also stood where that road crosses Tcharshamba river, on the southern bank; but the latter was certainly beyond the bounds of Iconium.

The villages of the Iconian territory have not been carefully or exhaustively examined; no part of Asia Minor

¹ Falsely called Ali-Bey-Keui in modern writers and maps; the error is due to ignorance of Turkish among travellers, who fail to understand the thick and difficult pronunciation of the peasantry. Keui means village.

has been explored with proper minuteness. There would be no difficulty in constructing a fairly accurate map of the territory, showing most of the villages; but much time would be required, with careful and skilful work. The villages were numerous, but the traces are slight. A few examples may here be given of those whose remains are most familiar.

On the road to the north-east, crossing Boz-Dagh towards Colonia Archelais (Ak-Serai) and central and northern Cappadocia, there was a village four hours from Iconium, out of whose ruins the grand old Turkish khan called Zazadin (perhaps Zaz-ed-Din¹) has been built. So many of the stones from the village church, evidently a large and fine building, have been built into the khan, that an architect, if allowed to demolish the khan, could probably rebuild the church almost complete. The ancient village was close to the khan; but its remains are now wholly covered by soil. The site is now absolutely deserted. The entire series of inscriptions built into the walls of the khan have been published by Rev. H. S. Cronin (who travelled with me in 1901) in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1902, p. 358 ff.

A second village on the same road lay at the edge of the plain, just below the point where it begins to ascend the low pass over Boz-Dagh. This site is described more fully in the following section. It has been entirely deserted in modern times, until a small khan, called Ak-Bash, was built (after 1901, before 1904) to accommodate travellers on the road, which is more traversed since the railway has begun to revive the prosperity of the country. An old khan called Kutu-Delik or Dibi-Delik stands about half a mile west of Ak-Bash. It has been built

¹ It is the finest known to me in any part of Asia Minor with the single exception of Sultan Khan (further N.E. on the same road), which is by far the most splendid in Turkey.

out of the ruins of a village which stood here (see § IV.).

On the road leading from Iconium north-north-east to Verinopolis and Ancyra there was an ancient village at Bunar-Bashi, twelve miles from Iconium, and probably another near the base of Boz-Dagh, these I have not examined. On the road leading south-east to the north end of Kara-Dagh a village was situated at the bridge called Seidi-Keupreu over the river Tcharshamba (see § I.) ; there is a large hillock or tumulus beside the bridge.

These are merely a few examples of the Iconian villages ; all but two have yielded inscriptions. Others I refrain from mentioning, whose traces are plain in inscriptions, etc. They do not always coincide with modern villages. Some are now absolutely uninhabited, while in many modern villages I saw no trace of ancient life except occasional stones, which had probably been carried. The ancient villages lay mostly on the roads. Hence they played a part in the spread of Christianity, as will be shown in the sequel.

Villages like those of the Iconian territory must be pointedly distinguished from the old class of Anatolian villages. The latter were real centres of population and life, possessing a certain individuality and character, which differed utterly from the character of the Hellenic City or self-governing State ; such villages were Oriental, and not Hellenic, in character ; and the native Anatolian "organization on the village system" is often mentioned as diametrically opposed to the Hellenic social and political ideals. Those villages of the Anatolian type had certain officials, such as komarchs, brabeutai, etc., varying in different districts : so, for example, the villages on Imperial estates, like Zizima, retained their ancient native character, and were absolutely non-Hellenic in character. But the villages on the soil of a Hellenic City-State were, so

to say, outlying parts or detached fragments of the central city. The free inhabitants were not villagers, but citizens of the city, and they shared in the political rights of the State. Such villages had no individual character or organization; it is their nature to look away from themselves to the city of which they are parts. Each free villager was expected to take part in the politics and administration of the city.

It is true that some traces of individual and separate character may be traced in the Iconian villages. Thus a village headman (*πρωτοκομήτης*) is mentioned,¹ but only during the fourth century or later, when the Hellenic City-State had lost almost all its nature and power; while during the Roman time, perhaps, there was in the villages of this class only a "first man of the village" (*πρώτος τῆς κώμης*), who possessed a certain influence by rank and seniority without definite official position. The exact status of the Iconian villages is, however, not quite certain. In certain cities of Asia Minor the villages seem to have retained more of their individuality than in the true Hellenic City-State; such cities, however, were hardly so strongly or early Hellenized as Iconium seems to have been; Hierapolis, near Laodiceia on the Lycus, is an example, and it was apparently strongly Anatolian in character as late as the time of Augustus.² The evidence at Iconium, though too scanty to permit certainty, favours the view that the villages were of the Hellenized type, mere outlying parts of the central city; see the account of the village Salarama in § IV.

¹ Mr. Cronin, *loc. cit.*, inclines to a different interpretation of the term (as I also once did). His chief argument is that no other example occurs in Asia Minor of *πρωτοκομήτης* in this sense; but in 1904 I found in this region another example of the term, evidently used in this sense, at Serai-Inn, a village in the territory of Laodiceia.

² *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, i. p. 97; on the villages of Hierapolis see Anderson in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1897, p. 411 f.

IV. ICONIUM A CITY OF GALATIA.

That Iconium in the time of St. Paul was a city of the Province called Galatia is now admitted by every one, even by Professor Schürer, the most stubborn opponent of Galatic provincial unity. The question now is, how long that connexion lasted. The view has been stated in my writings on this subject that Iconium and Lystra were included in Galatia until the reorganization of the provinces in the latter part of the third century. Monsieur Imhoof-Blumer, on the contrary, in his great work on the coins of Asia Minor, places Iconium in the Eparchia Lycaonia, which was formed (as we saw in § II.) about 138 A.D. No one, as a rule, is more accurate in such matters than the great Swiss numismatist; but the evidence is here against him.

That Iconium belonged to the Province Galatia until the end of the third century can be proved, not indeed with the conclusive certainty with which the date of the colonial foundation has been demonstrated in § II., but at least with an approximation to certainty much closer than is possible for many universally accepted facts of ancient history. The best authority for the limits of the Province about the end of the third century is the very brief *Acta* of Saint Eustochios in the time of Maximian. Eustochios was a pagan priest at Vasada, who adopted Christianity after seeing the steadfastness of the martyrs, and came for baptism to Eudoxius, bishop of Antioch. Afterwards, as a Christian presbyter, he went to Lystra, where he had relatives. He was arrested, taken to Ancyra, tried and executed with his relatives and children. It is here clearly shown that Vasada was subject to the bishop of Antioch, and that Lystra was in the Province of Galatia, of which Ancyra was the capital.¹ Had

¹ Ptolemy in the middle of the second century likewise places both Vasada and Lystra in the Province Galatia (as Antioch was).

Lystra been reckoned as a city of Lycaonia, a prisoner arrested there would have been taken for trial to the metropolis of the Province, whether this was some Lycaonian city, or (as is more probable) Tarsus in Cilicia.¹ Now, if Vasada and Lystra were in Galatia, much more must Iconium, which lay directly on the way from both cities to Ancyra, have been in Galatia.

Some writers may refuse to be convinced by this evidence, as the tale of St. Eustochios is not preserved in an independent form, but is merely related in Greek Menaea under 23 June, and the Menaea are confessedly not an authority of high character. But, although the form in which the tale has been preserved is quite late, it must rest on some good and early authority. Somewhere about the end of the third century Lystra ceased to be under Ancyra; and after that time such a tale could not have been invented.

Moreover, other authorities confirm the *Acta* of Eustochios. Ptolemy indeed is confused and self-contradictory: he says quite rightly that Vasada and Lystra were in the Province of Galatia, but he assigns the district Lycaonia to the Province of Cappadocia, and gives in it seven cities, one being Iconium. This absurd and utterly unhistorical classification is due to his mixing up authorities of different periods. His Galatian list is good; and, though not a complete enumeration, is correct so far as it goes, whereas the Cappadocian list is full of inaccuracies and blunders, to explain which so as to gain any knowledge from the list involves elaborate argument and a good deal of hypothesis. We therefore leave Ptolemy aside for the moment.

¹ So, for example, Claudius, Asterius, and their companions were arrested at Laranda in Lycaonia in 285 A.D., and carried before the proconsul, who ordinarily resided in Cilicia: they were taken about in his progress through Cilicia and finally executed at Aigai, many miles east of Tarsus (*Acta Sanctorum*, 23 Aug., p. 567). The Province of the Three Eparchiai, Cilicia-Lycaonia-Isauria, existed as late as 285.

All doubt, however, is set at rest by a milestone, found close under the south slope of the Boz-Dagh in Iconian territory on the direct road from Iconium to Archelais and the north-eastern lands (§ III.). It was erected at the order of the governor of the Province Galatia, C. Atticius Strabo, in 198 A.D.

It is unquestionable that this milestone originally stood on Galatian territory; and we may confidently say also that it stood from the beginning close to its present position in the plain below the Iconian end of the pass. There was here a village or settlement under Iconian jurisdiction, and the ruinous old Turkish khan,¹ in which the milestone is built, has been constructed out of the stones of this village, in the same way as Zazadin Khan (see § III.) was built. The name of the village was (as will be shown below) probably Salarama.

It is true, indeed, that stones are often carried from a considerable distance to be used in modern buildings; but the stones which are thus brought are chosen because their shape and size make them suitable for the purpose; and moreover transport is now more necessary because the supply close at hand has been exhausted. But any observant traveller—few archæological travellers, however, are observant in such matters—can in almost every case determine whether the stones in a large building, situated in a now lonely and isolated situation like this khan, have been transported from a distance or found on the spot. Such evidence should always be noticed and recorded; but how rarely is it that any so-called explorer condescends to observe details of this kind.² Yet out of such details history is built.

¹ The name has been almost forgotten. Professor Sterrett in 1881 got it as Dibi-Delik, I in 1901 and 1905 as Kutu-Delik; but Monsieur Cousin in 1898 was told that it was Sindjerli Khan (as I was by careless informants): there is a village Sindjerli, about two hours to the south, and Sindjerli-Khan is near that village.

² The place was visited in 1898 by a European professional archæ-

A milestone, obviously, is the kind of stone which no one would carry far, especially over a mountainous pass, to build a wall: an irregular column, very rough in surface, thicker at one end, large and weighty, it is as unsuitable for building purposes as any stone can well be. Not far from it is a large flat slab, on which once stood the altar or table in the village church: it shows the four square holes at the four corners and a larger central hole, circular, surrounding an inner, smaller square hole, in which the five supports of the sacred Trapeza were fitted, with a dedicatory inscription on the front edge "the vow of Cyriacus." Had this stone been transported from a distance it would have been broken, either for convenience of transport, or from accident by the way. If it were broken into small fragments, too, it would be far more useful for building; but, as it stands, it is nearly as unsuitable as the milestone. The mere weight of these stones is prohibitive. They were put into the walls, in spite of their inconvenient shape, because they happened to be lying near at hand, and it entailed less trouble to utilize them as they were than to break and trim them, or to transport other more suitable stones from elsewhere.

Still more important and conclusive evidence is got from another huge block, in the wall of the khan, which must weigh many tons and could not be carried far by Turkish builders. It bears the Greek epitaph of C. Aponius Firmus, who had served as a cavalry soldier in the Roman army and attained the rank of a petty officer. Aponius belonged to a family which lived in this village of the Iconian territory, and he was buried in the family burying-place here. It was a family of some wealth and importance, as can be gathered from the facts: this huge block of fine limestone must have belonged to a large ologist, who has published a minute account of his journey, with copies of the inscriptions, but without one word explaining the character of the place, even the modern name being stated falsely.

mausoleum, and the inscription extended over two blocks at least, and is engraved in large finely-cut letters of the second or third century. Considerable expense was required in constructing such a tomb, as the limestone must have been carried a good many miles: such transport was commonly practised in Roman times, though Turkish engineering was rarely capable of it. Moreover the "large letters" of the inscription¹ imply some pretension and a desire for conspicuousness. Another fine limestone block (not so big or weighty as this) from the same village cemetery, perhaps part of the same mausoleum, certainly from the grave of a member of the same family, has been carried seven or eight miles south across the plain to another old Turkish khan, called Sindjerli. It was the gravestone of C. Aponius Crispus, who had been duumvir (i.e. supreme magistrate) of the colonia Iconium somewhere about 135-170 A.D. It also is written in Greek.²

The family of Aponius or Apponius was therefore possessed of, and resident ordinarily on, a property in this northern part of the Iconian territory. Members of the family entered the Imperial service, and held office in the city; but their burial place was at their country residence, about twenty-five miles north-east from Iconium. The relation of the villages in the Iconian territory to the central city has been treated in § III., and this Aponian family furnishes an excellent example. It received the Roman citizenship, and took the name of a Roman family, well-known in the first and second centuries,³ some member of which had been in relations with the first member of the Aponian family who attained the citizenship. The name and the rights were transmitted to his descendants in the usual way. This family has nothing of the village character

¹ See Gal. vi. 11; *Histor. Comm. on Gal.*, 464 f.

² The name in this case is spelt Apponius.

³ The best known is Aponius Saturninus, a prominent supporter of Vespasian in the war of A.D. 69, who afterwards was Proconsul of Asia.

about it : it was evidently Iconian, in one generation after another, using the Greek language, and following the usual course of municipal office, like other members of distinguished Iconian families.

Another inscription in Sindjerli khan, a dedication to Zeus Salaramens, shows the local name. This Zeus, according to a common custom, derived his name from the locality ; and as both inscriptions are likely to have been brought from one place,¹ there is much probability that the village at the foot of the pass was Salarama.

Thus our argument has afforded a decisive proof that the village at the south end of the pass formed part of the Iconian City-State, and that the whole State, like this part, was still included in the Province Galatia as late as A.D. 198 ; and this practically means that the connexion between Iconium and the Province Galatia lasted unbroken from the institution of the Province in 25 B.C. until about the end of the third century after Christ.

Incidentally, this result gives a pleasant confirmation of the trustworthiness of the *Acta* of Eustochios ; and it is to be hoped that some fuller record of the martyrdom may hereafter be discovered ; in all probability the *Acta* would throw some welcome light on the condition of Vasada and Lystra about A.D. 250-300.

It may appear immaterial as regards the Pauline period, whether Iconium was Galatian in the second and third centuries after Christ ; but such a way of looking at the case is essentially superficial. Though the point does not directly concern the interpretation of Acts, it has indirectly an important bearing on it. You cannot get a proper conception of the character of a Hellenic city by looking at it in one period alone : you must regard it as a living organism, you must understand the history and law of its

¹ Thus, for example, the discovery of Savatra in 1901 resulted from the report that many stones for the Tchelebi Effendi's country house beside Iconium had been brought from a village 12 hours distant.

growth, and to do so you must "look before and after" the period that immediately concerns you.

In regard to Iconium the critical question in recent discussion has, undoubtedly, been whether or not its incorporation in the Province Galatia was merely nominal and external, or was a real and vital fact of Roman organization, which would affect the character of the city, i.e. of the Iconian people. In thinking of a Hellenic city one must always keep clearly in mind the principle of city life as stated by Thucydides: a city is constituted not by walls and buildings but by men. The Hellenic city was an association of free citizens, taking action voluntarily for the common good by choosing individuals out of their number to whom they should entrust for a limited time certain powers to be exercised for the benefit of the whole city, leaving the individual citizen free and uncontrolled except in so far as all by common consent curtailed their own rights in order to make the city safer and stronger.

The question as to the Galatian character of Iconium, then, really amounts to this—was the Roman provincial organization in the first century a mere fetter on the free Hellenizing development which had begun in the city at least two centuries earlier, an institution too alien in character to touch the heart and spirit and life of the citizens? or was it a real influence affecting their thoughts and life and conduct?

The answer to that question is of prime consequence both for the historian and for the student of the New Testament. The character and the measure of Roman influence on Western Asia is involved in it: the meaning of the terms "Galatia" and "Galatians," with all the numerous consequences for the life, chronology, sphere of influence and direction of missionary effort of St. Paul, turns upon it.

In the first place we observe that, if the influence of the Roman organization on Iconium and the rest of the group

of the Pauline cities of South Galatia had been so essentially weak as writers like Prof. E. Schürer and Professor Zöckler represent it to have been, it must have been evanescent and could not have lasted. As we have seen, Hadrian modified the organization of South-eastern Asia Minor, to give freer play and stronger effect to the racial and national spirit. There was then a favourable opportunity to separate Iconium from the Province Galatia, if the connexion had previously been only external and fettering. But, inasmuch as the connexion of Iconium with the Province Galatia persisted through the reorganization, the probability that the connexion was strong and real is much increased. The Romans had hitherto always thought and spoken of Iconium as situated in the half-barbarian half-Romanized Lycaonia, one of the component parts of their Province Galatia. But about 130-138 A.D. they separated it from Lycaonia, and left it in the Province Galatia, at the time when they were forming a Commune of the Lycaonians in a new Province to attach them more closely to Rome. The Iconians themselves had all along distinguished themselves from Lycaonia as being citizens of a Phrygian Hellenic city; and now the Romans recognized Iconium as a Roman colony, with the highest class of Roman rights permissible for a city of the East, in their old Province of Galatia.

Secondly, Iconium had been attached to the Galatian State before the Roman Province of Galatia was constituted. Amyntas, king of Galatia, ruled over it; and the view has been maintained elsewhere that Iconium was taken by the Gauls about 165-160 B.C.¹ Now, it is true that very few references to the Galatian connexion have been found in Iconium; but extremely few inscriptions of Iconium are known earlier than the colonial foundation, and the only document which bears on the provincial

¹ *Studia Biblica*, iv. p. 51.

connexion mentions the Galatic Province. In considering whether the people of a city in the Galatic Province would accept for themselves the address "Galatians," we may appeal to the analogy of another city of the same region. Take the case of Apollonia in Pisidian Phrygia, far further distant from northern Galatia than Iconium was, handed over by the Romans to Amyntas, the last Galatian king: the Galatian connexion must inevitably have been far weaker there than in Iconium. Yet at Apollonia in A.D. 222 a citizen spoke of his city, in an inscription that has fortunately been preserved, as his "fatherland of the Galatians,"¹ and mentioned his son's career of honourable municipal office among the noble Trokmians. It is not necessary to remind the reader that the "fatherland," to the Greek mind, was one's own city, and not a country or a large region; but (since even so great a scholar as Waddington, not to mention others of lesser standing, has not ventured to draw the true and only allowable inference) it is necessary to point out that, in a monument exposed to public view in Apollonia it was impossible to speak of any place except Apollonia as "fatherland," unless the context indicated that another city was meant.

Apollonia, therefore, ethnically a purely Phrygian city, by education a Hellenic city, was politically so thoroughly a Galatian city in the third century, that an ordinary citizen would speak of its people in this simple and direct way as Galatians; to hold a magistracy in Apollonia was "to be glorified among the Trokmoi." In this last phrase the name of one tribe is used as a mere poetic variation of "Galatai"; a second term was needed both to avoid the repetition of Galatai in two successive lines and for metrical reasons.² Now, if in Apollonia people could speak in

¹ See Lebas-Waddington, 1192.

² In *Studia Biblica*, iv. p. 52 f., failing to observe the "poetic licence," I inferred that this region of the Galatic Province was incorporated in one of the three Galatian tribes; but that inference seems less probable than the

this tone and spirit, there cannot exist a doubt in the mind of any one who is guided by evidence and not by antecedent prejudice, that in the southern cities of the Province generally the Romanizing spirit was strong enough to affect thought and expression, and to make the address "Galatai" acceptable to an audience gathered out of several Galatian cities.

It may be objected that the actual examples which can be quoted are rare, one in Iconium, and one in Apollonia; but this is a valueless argument. These are the only cases which exist, there are no other cases to quote on the other side, and these are of the kind where one is practically as good a proof as a score, for one shows what was the familiar public custom.

Thus from these details, recovered one by one through many years of travel and study—during which the isolated facts, insignificant and almost worthless in themselves, have acquired meaning and value through juxtaposition with one another—there is gradually built up a unified conception of Iconium as a city of Hellenized character, situated in the extremest corner of the Phrygian land (where the Phrygians had encroached on what was in a geographical view really part of the great Lycaonian plain),¹ but so strongly penetrated with Roman feeling and loyalty that it was honoured with the imperial name about A.D. 41, and finally raised to the dignity of a Roman Colony about

explanation now suggested. I also misinterpreted the date, being afraid, like Waddington, to follow the rule that cities of these regions dated from the organisation of the Province (Asia or Galatia, as the case was); the correct dating does away with one of the witnesses called to prove the scarcity in the days of Claudius, and therefore requires the deletion of three lines also in *S. Paul the Trav.* p. 49, *Christ Born in Bethlehem*, p. 252; but I am glad that in all three places I spoke of the dating as uncertain, so that the strength of the argument in them is unaffected. I saw this inscription for the first time in 1905, and recognized that it must be placed 150–250 A.D.

¹ So regarded by Strabo, Cicero, Pliny in some passages, and the Romans generally. Pliny's variation is due to his dependence on different authorities.

A.D, 135. It always held aloof from its Lycaonian neighbours and fellow-provincials, and clung to its first Roman connexion with the Province Galatia for more than three hundred years, for Galatia was much more thoroughly Romanized than the "Three Eparchies." Its coins show that in the first and second centuries it boasted especially of its semi-Greek origin from the Greek hero Perseus conquering the native population. Later a more distinctively Phrygian origin seems to have been claimed in popular legend. But through all times and authorities the mixed character of the city is apparent.

V. THE CONSTITUTION OF ICONIUM.

This mixture of people and character explains the strange expression employed in an inscription, "the four *stemmata* of the Colony"¹; these *stemmata* must be interpreted as the four tribes into which the Colony was divided, and the number apparently corresponded (as the term *stemmata* seems to prove) to the four elements out of which the population was composed. Unfortunately the names of only three of the tribes are known, and some of them only in later forms of Imperial character.

One was the Tribe of Athena, with an epithet following, which has been lost through a break in the stone: this epithet may have been some Imperial title, but is more likely to have been Zizimmene, for a Latin dedication to Minerva Zizimmene has been found at Iconium.² This dedication proves that, as has been already stated in § I., the Athena or Minerva of Iconium was merely a Hellenized form of the Phrygian Mother-Goddess; and, therefore

¹ Τοῖς τέσσαρσιν στέμμασιν τη[s] κο[λω]νίας (C.I.G. 3995*b*, where τη[s] οἰκο[δομ]ίας is restored meaninglessly): the term *prostatai*, which follows, denotes the heads of Tribes, and proves that the *stemmata* represent four tribes of the Colony. On the tribes see an article in *Classical Review*, to be published about November, 1905. The same term *stemma* was used at Colonia Antiochia.

² It is published in C.I.L., iii. no. 13638.

(whether or not the epithet Zizimmene should be restored in the name of the Tribe), there can be little doubt that the Phrygian part of the population was enrolled in the Tribe of Athena. This would be in point of numbers a very large tribe.

Another Tribe bore the name Hadriana Herculana, and a third was styled Augusta. It is impossible to say what racial elements were incorporated in these Tribes, but perhaps the Roman citizens were placed in the Augustan Tribe. There are analogies that favour this supposition. The Roman citizens, however, could not have been sufficiently numerous under Augustus to constitute even a small Tribe, and other racial elements may have been incorporated in subdivisions of the Tribe.

This Augustan Tribe was doubtless an older institution, renamed in honour of Augustus. It may have contained also the new population introduced when Iconium was made a Hellenized self-governing city out of a mere Anatolian town. That event is not likely to be so old as the Seleucid rule: the Seleucid kings held the cities of these regions apparently as a purely subject population without any Hellenic rights.

The city was probably Pergamenian.¹ Iconium was in the territory granted to the Pergamenian king Eumenes by the Romans in 189 B.C.; and it was the invariable custom of those Greek or semi-Greek kings to maintain their power by establishing Hellenized cities, with an accession of population devoted to the founders' interests, as centres of Hellenism.²

It is, however, practically certain that Lycaonia, though given to Eumenes, was too remote to be firmly held by him or his successors; and thus Iconium was likely to acquire that self-centred and individualized character,

¹ Asklepios and Dionysos were the two chief Pergamenian deities, see the *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 121.

² *Letters to the Seven Churches*, chaps. xi., xii.

differentiating it from other foundations of the Pergamenian kings, which is apparent in the scanty records of its constitution and history. This Augustan Tribe was perhaps the stronghold of the Hellenizing spirit in Iconium, and originally consisted of settlers introduced by the kings of Pergamum.

The Tribe Hadriana, Herculana was evidently an old Tribe, united in the worship of Hercules, which received an additional title in honour of Hadrian. On coins of Iconium Hercules appears in a purely Greek form, as the hero with the club and the lion's skin. But in those regions the Hercules who was actually worshipped was an oriental deity who gave a new name, Heracleia, to the Cappadocian town Cybistra, and was similar in character to the Cilician Sun-God Sandan. No evidence justifies even a conjecture as to the character of this Tribe.

The name of the fourth Tribe is unknown; but when we take into consideration the long Galatian connexion, beginning probably about 160 B.C., and remember that a monastery "of the Galatians" existed at Iconium,¹ the probability is evident that a Galatian element was introduced into Iconium, and this element naturally and necessarily must have been formed into a distinct Tribe, whether that of Hercules, or some other.

That a body of Jewish settlers existed at Iconium is certain; but whether these Jews were citizens or merely resident strangers is as yet unknown. If they were citizens, they could hold the rights only as a distinct Tribe or as a special and exclusive division of a Tribe.² Evidence is still very defective; but any day may reveal a decisive document. The names of the three Tribes just enumerated, and the fact that the Tribes had each a *prostates* as its official head, were revealed by inscriptions discovered in 1905 and still unpublished. Previously the constitution of Iconium was wholly unknown. W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ *Studia Biblica*, iv. p. 32.

² *Letters to the Seven Churches*, chap. xii.

MANASSEH'S JERUSALEM.

c. 690-640 B.C.

IN 701—and perhaps again, as we have seen,¹ about 690—Jerusalem experienced a sudden and wonderful deliverance from the arms of Assyria. So impressive an attestation of Divine favour was not without its preparations, political, religious and moral. Under Uzziah (c. 783-740) the City had greatly increased in size, in wealth and in strength. In 721 Samaria, her only political rival in Israel, was destroyed. For more than a century the influence of her Temple had steadily, though slowly, grown at the inevitable expense of other shrines in Judah. And we have been able to follow the traces of a gradual elevation in the moral sense of her community.² The meaning of these events and tendencies was first fully articulated by Isaiah.³ Jerusalem was not “everything to Isaiah”; but he was sent to read to her people her previous discipline, to display her as the hinge of God’s present providence with the world, and, under conditions, as the capital of His abiding Kingdom. While scourging the vices of her population under Uzziah and Jotham, Isaiah declared that God had trained Jerusalem to be *The City of Righteousness*. The Temple was the vestibule of His Palace and Presence. Sion was His hearth: a refuge which He had founded for the remnant of His people. To all this history and its prophetic interpretation the Deliverance of Jerusalem came as God’s own signature. We are too prone to consider the great event by itself, and to trace to it alone the subsequent prestige of the City. Apart from that previous history and prophecy the Deliverance would have been as a seal without a document to it.

¹ EXPOSITOR, September, 1905.

² Id., April and May, 1905.

³ Id., July, 1905.

In estimating the effect of all three upon the destiny of Jerusalem, we must distinguish the various qualities of imagination and conscience, which they roused, among her mixed and fickle people. Of such qualities there were at least three; the conscience of the executive statesmen, the popular imagination, and the more spiritual convictions of the prophets themselves.

As to the first, we find explicit statements in the Second Book of Kings. The Deuteronomic editor of that book attributes to King Hezekiah a number of religious reforms, some of which are sympathetic with, while others were actually required by, the earlier teaching of the great prophet.¹ Hezekiah (we are told) *brake in pieces the bronze serpent, which Moses had made, for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it, and it was called Nehushtan*. There can be no doubt about the fact of this particular reform, and we may safely assume that it implies the removal, or at least the attempt to remove, all the idolatries against which Isaiah had inveighed. Isaiah's indictment of the idols and the sacred trees had been so absolute, that it is hard to believe that Hezekiah postponed their abolition to so late a date in his reign as after 701. But the acceptance which has been granted to the record of this reform has been denied to the clause which precedes it—*he removed the high places and brake the pillars and cut down the Ashērôth*²—on the grounds, that the grammatical form of the clause is late, that there is no evidence of Isaiah's hostility to the three objects which it mentions and that they were still in use at the beginning of Josiah's reign. The question is difficult, and an answer perhaps not now attainable. But, because the Book of Deuteronomy, which contains explicit laws against the high places, the pillars and the Asherôth, is certainly compiled from earlier sources,

¹ 1 Kings xviii. 1.

² Plural, after the LXX.

and because such written laws were (as we have seen in other cases) probably the result of specific acts of reform, it is quite possible that Hezekiah instituted measures for the abolition of all three institutions of the earlier religion of Israel. That his reforms were of a drastic character,¹ is proved by the violence of the reaction against them under Manasseh. Nor is it a conclusive objection to the introduction of these particulars in the list of Hezekiah's reforms, that Isaiah does not enforce them by name. In such a movement there are always some details achieved, which its spiritual leaders have not actually defined in their statement of its principles. We have seen the faint beginnings of a tendency towards the centralization of the worship of Judah nearly a century before Isaiah.² And, indeed, so pure a faith as he urged upon his people involved such a centralization as one of its most practical consequences. To us it may seem paradoxical that the doctrine of the One God should carry as its corollary the doctrine of the One Sanctuary; *neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father: the hour now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.* But in the religious circumstances of that time there was indeed no greater safeguard for monotheism than by confining the national worship to the Temple. The rural shrines of Jahweh had previously been shrines of local gods, and in their ritual, as in their worshippers' conceptions of the godhead, must have perpetuated the influences of the ancient polytheism. In name belonging to Jahweh, in reality they were devoted to the Baalim—*according to the number of thy cities are thy gods, O Judah.*³ The worship

¹ "Die erste Durchführung der Forderungen des Jahvismus": "eine völlige Durchführung des Jahvismus in seiner streng monotheistischen Bedeutung mit teilweiser Beseitigung anderer Kulte." Winckler, *KAT*, 3rd ed., p. 271; cf. Guthe, *Gesch.* p. 223.

² *EXPOSITOR*, April, 1905.

³ *Jer.* xi. 13.

of one *Jahweh*, spiritual and non-idolatrous, was possible only in the Temple. Again, the rural sanctuaries had all been violated by the Assyrian invasion of 701; and further, the smallness of the Israelite territory since the collapse of the Northern Kingdom in 721 and the exile of its people, rendered practicable the periodical assembly at Jerusalem of all the worshippers of *Jahweh*. Even, therefore, if Hezekiah did not actually succeed in centralizing the national cult in the capital, there is no reason to doubt that he inaugurated such a policy. The political and religious motives to it were all present before the end of his reign. It need not have been started at the same time as the measures for removing the idols. Centralization may have first suggested itself when the latter movement was found to be impossible so long as the rural sanctuaries remained; and it was, no doubt, greatly facilitated by the overthrow of these sanctuaries in 701, and by the vindication of the unique inviolableness of Jerusalem. The *removal of the high places* by Hezekiah is therefore more probable after than before that date.

Of the effect of the Deliverance of Jerusalem on the popular imagination we can have no doubt. For a century Assyria had been the fear of the peoples of Palestine. The citizens of Jerusalem had heard Isaiah himself describe, in periods which marched like their subject, the progress of the monstrous hosts of the North: their unbroken ranks, their pitiless and irresistible advance. Further and further south this had pressed, overwhelming Northern Israel, spreading around Judah, and rising over the land to the very walls of Jerusalem. From these her citizens at last saw with their own eyes the predicted and long-imagined forms of their terror, knowing that behind them lay exile and destruction for the people of God. Then suddenly the Assyrian army vanished and Jerusalem was left the one unviolated fortress on the long, ruin-strewn path of the

conqueror. We need not wait for answers to the difficult questions of the date and value of the Scriptures which celebrate the Deliverance. The bare facts, about which there is no doubt, attest their own effects in the temper of the Jewish people. Upon minds too coarse to appreciate Isaiah's reading of the moral vocation and destiny of their City, her signal relief (or reliefs) from so invincible a foe, must have made a profound impression. The Jews had seen the rest of the sacred territory violated, and a great proportion of its population carried into exile. Here alone the foe had been kept back. Alone the Temple remained secure. From this time, therefore, rose the belief, which we find seventy years later hardened into a dogma, that Jerusalem was inviolable. No article of religion could have been more popular. Among the mass of the citizens, undoubtedly increased by the devastation of the rest of the country, it must have spread with rapidity; and the measures for centralizing the national worship in the Temple, in so far as they were successful, can only have assisted its propagation.

But we must not suppose that such a belief was wholly accepted by the more spiritual of the prophets. Micah had predicted that *Sion should be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem become heaps, and the mountain of the House as the high places of a jungle*.¹ And although Isaiah had foretold the Deliverance, and almost unaided had sustained the courage of Jerusalem till it came, he did not, we may be sure, believe in the survival of the City apart from those moral conditions which the popular faith in her inviolableness was certain to ignore, but upon which it had been the constant energy of his long career to insist. We may not even assert that Isaiah was devoted to the centralization of the national worship. No share in this is imputed to him by the records. His practical genius may have felt that it

¹ iii, 12.

was necessary in the interests of the purification of the religion, but its tendency towards formality and superstition would be surely as obvious to him in his old age as they were seventy years later to Jeremiah.

Whatever was the extent of the religious reforms of the time, their stability became endangered by the disappearance of the two personalities, on whom they had depended, soon after the (probable) second Deliverance of the City about 690. Hezekiah died not later than 685, perhaps even a few years earlier,¹ and with him or soon after him Isaiah, whose ministry had already lasted more than fifty years. The new king Manasseh was a boy. Ahaz, who had favoured the religious fashions of the Canaanites and Assyrians, was his grandfather. All the conditions, therefore, made a reaction against the reforms an easy possibility. But to understand its extent as well as its character we must look at the political history of the period.

¹ 2 Kings xxi. 1 assigns 55 years to the reign of Manasseh. If we take 641 as the year of his death, this would fix the death of Hezekiah in 696 or 695; if we take 638, then Hezekiah in the Biblical datum lived till 692 (Rost) or 698 (cf. Guthe, *Gesch.* 253). The accession of Tirhakah was in 691, and the probable second Deliverance of Jerusalem, as we have seen between 691 and 689. Winckler (*KAT*, 3rd ed. 274) suggests that Manasseh and not Hezekiah was king of Judah at this time, but there are not sufficient grounds for such a hypothesis. Accepting the Biblical statement that the king of Judah was still Hezekiah after Tirhakah's accession in 691, two hypotheses become possible: that the second Deliverance took place in 690, that Hezekiah died immediately after it, and that Manasseh reigned till at least 637, which is not probable; or that there is a mistake of ten years in the datum of 2 Kings xxi. 1, and that we should read 45 instead of 55 as the years of Manasseh's reign. This would give us 683 as the year of Hezekiah's death, reckoning back from 638 or 639, or 685 reckoning back from 641. According to the Biblical data Hezekiah reigned 29 years (2 Kings xviii. 2), his sixth year was 722-1, that of the fall of Samaria (*Ibid.* 10) and his fourteenth 701, that of Sennacherib's invasion of Judah (*Ibid.* 13)! To which of these latter contradictory statements are we to adhere? Each has its supporters. Or are we to say both are wrong, and with Winckler and others place Hezekiah's accession in 720 and his death in 692? This, of course, is only possible on the hypothesis, that not Hezekiah but Manasseh was king when Tirhakah advanced on Sennacherib's army in Palestine—a hypothesis for which, as we have seen, there are no grounds.

There is no period of Jewish history more full of darkness and vague sound. The record in the Book of Kings of Manasseh's long reign is brief and late; but it reverberates with the echoes both of great movements external to the Jewish state, for the exact course of which the Assyrian annals supply considerable evidence; and of convulsions within Jerusalem, the precipitates from which lie heavy on the later memory of the Jewish nation and deeply imbue the substance of their religion.

The record of Manasseh's reign¹ is not even in part an extract from the annals of the kings of Judah, but merely a summary of the king's evil deeds, judged from the Deuteronomic standpoint. Though thus subordinate to a distinct ethical intention, the passage is not a unity. It contains repetitions, and apparently gradual accretions from more than one hand.² It presupposes the Exile.³ On the other hand many of the details which it attributes to Manasseh are accredited from other sources: from Deuteronomy, the revival of Canaanite forms of worship, Baal-altars and Asherôth; from Deuteronomy and the prophets, the introduction of the worship of the host of heaven⁴; from Jeremiah, the drenching of Jerusalem with innocent blood.⁵

The lateness of this record is in nothing more manifest than in its silence with regard to the Palestine campaigns of Asarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, and the close traffic of Judah with Assyria which took place during Manasseh's

¹ 2 Kings xxi. 1-18.

² The passage has been variously divided between the two Deuteronomic redactions of the Books of Kings. To one of these Skinner assigns verses 1-6, 16-18, to the other 7-15. To the former Marti assigns only 1, 2a and 16.

³ Verse 8. Verse 5, because it speaks of *two* courts to the Temple, is also generally taken as post-exilic; but in addition to the forecourt proper of Solomon's Temple there was an outer court within the boundary wall of the whole complex of his buildings; cf. 1 Kings vi. 36 with vii. 12. This against Benzinger on 2 Kings xxi. 5.

⁴ Deut. iv. 19, xvi. 3; Zeph. i. 5; Jer. viii. 2, xix. 13, xliv. 17 ff.

⁵ Jer. xix. 4.

reign. Of all this the record contains only one clear echo, the statement of the introduction of *the worship of the host of heaven*. That cult was Babylonian, and its adoption at this time by Jerusalem was due to the political and social subjection of Judah to Assyria. In spite of the great Deliverance from Sennacherib the Jewish state remained, or early in Manasseh's reign again became, Assyria's vassal. "Manasseh of Judah" appears twice as an Assyrian tributary: once in 677-6, when as one of twenty-two kings he paid homage to Asarhaddon as "king of the *city of Judah*,"¹ and again as one of the same group who furnished "men and ships in addition to the customary tribute" on Ashurbanipal's first campaign against Egypt in 668.²

In 678 the king of Sidon, in alliance with a Cilician prince, revolted from Assyria. Asarhaddon's vengeance was immediate and complete. He destroyed the ancient city on an island and built on the mainland a new town, named after himself, in which he established an Assyrian administration and the worship of the Assyrian pantheon.³ In 676 the arms of Assyria for the first time crossed the border of Egypt, only however to suffer defeat.⁴ But in 671-670 a second Egyptian campaign was successful, and Egypt became an Assyrian province. When Tirhakah, from the south, recovered it in the following year, Asarhaddon prepared a third expedition, continued, upon his death (668 or 667) by Ashurbanipal, who within two years had twice to drive back the restless Tirhakah

¹ C. H. W. Johns in *Enc. Bibl.* col. 1332; cf. H. F. Talbot, *Records of the Past*, 1st series, iii. 107 (Kouyunjik Inscr. of Esarhaddon, now in British Museum); and Winckler, *KAT*, 3rd. ed., 87. Col. v. of the 2nd, Nebi Yunus, Inscription of Asarhaddon (lines 11 to 26) records a review of the twenty-two kings apparently at Nineveh, to which they brought with them materials for the adornment of the palace there (Talbot, *op. cit.* 120).

² L. W. King, *Enc. Bibl.* coll. 372 f: cf. Winckler, *KAT*, 3rd ed. 87, and G. Smith, *Rec. of the Past*, 1st series, i. 62.

Hexagonal Prism, col. 1.

⁴ *Babyl. Chron.* iv. 10, 16; see Winckler, *KAT*, 3rd ed. 88.

into Ethiopia, suppress an Egyptian revolt, and then capture Thebes from Tirhakah's successor. The fall of Thebes resounded through Western Asia,¹ but failed to place a permanent stamp on the Assyrian power in Egypt, for about 660 or perhaps a few years later² Psametik I. asserted his independence. Tyre had submitted to Ashurbanipal in 668, and in spite of the Egyptian revolt all Palestine remained quiet for the next decade. Then the revolt of Babylon (652-648) roused the tribes of Northern Arabia, Edom, Moab and Hauran, and even the Phœnicians in Usu and Acco, and must have excited Judah and his immediate neighbours, who, however, did not actively rebel. It has been supposed that the historical fact underlying the Jewish Chronicler's account of Manasseh's captivity in Babylon is that, in order to clear himself of the suspicion of complicity in the revolt of 652 onwards, Manasseh paid homage in person to Ashurbanipal, when the latter had at last conquered and was residing in Babylon.³ But it is equally possible to suppose that, as the Chronicler says, Manasseh's temporary residence in Babylon was an enforced one, and this may have taken place earlier. Asarhaddon's annals seem to imply that the twenty-two kings of Syria and the Levant, of whom Manasseh was one, appeared before him at Nineveh.⁴

Such, so far as Palestine is concerned, is the history of the Assyrian Empire during the long reign of Manasseh. Under Asarhaddon and Ashurbanipal that Empire reached its widest bounds, and, though its final collapse was near, the summit of its culture and of its ability to impress this

¹ Cf. Nahum iii. 8.

² "C. 660," W. Max Müller in the *Enc. Bibl.*, col. 1245. Guthe, *Gesch.* 233, puts the date as late as "about 645."

³ So Winckler in *A. T. Untersuchungen*, 122, followed by Benzinger on 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11-13, and Guthe, *Gesch.* 227. Winckler has altered his opinion and placed Manasseh's visit to Babylon under Asarhaddon: *KAT*, 3rd ed. 274 f.

⁴ See above n.

upon its subject peoples. Intellectually and religiously the Assyrian culture was Babylonian. Never, since the time of the Tell el-Amarna correspondence, had the civilization of Mesopotamia so permeated the life of Palestine. We have seen how Asarhaddon established his officials and his gods at Sidon,¹ how he and Ashurbanipal organized an Assyrian administration in Egypt, and how Jewish soldiers were brought in to the Assyrian armies. Both monarchs appear to have added to the number of Mesopotamian colonists in Samaria,² who introduced the worship of their own gods, and whose influence upon the native customs of the province may be easily imagined by those who have seen the changes effected in social life East of the Jordan at the present day by the Circassian colonists introduced by the Turkish Government. Nor are we without contemporary records of Assyrian administration and influence in Palestine during the period. Mr. Macalister has just discovered at Gezer two cuneiform tablets, deeds of sale of land, which there is no reason to suppose are not "genuine products of the ancient dwellers at Gezer."³ The dates of these documents are 651 and 649, and they prove that under Ashurbanipal fields at Gezer, one of which belonged to a man with a Jewish name, Nathaniah, were sold, and the sales were registered according to Assyrian formulas, in the Assyrian language, and in the one case by a notary with so unmistakeable an Assyrian name as Nergal-shar-usur.⁴

¹ As early as 711 Sargon had introduced some measure of Assyrian administration into Ashdod.

² 2 Kings xvii. 24 ff.—which appears to assign this settlement wholly to Sargon after 721, but evidently contains later elements—compared with the Book of Ezra in which the Samaritans assert their descent from colonists settled by Asarhaddon (iv. 2), and this is also traced to those of Osnappar, or Ashurbanipal (iv. 10).

³ Rev. C. H. W. Johns, *Pal. Expl. Fund Quarterly*, 1905, 206.

⁴ Cf. Nergal-sharezer, one of the princes of the king of Babylon mentioned by Baruch, Jer. xxxix. 3. 13.

It will be observed that while most of these instances of the enforcement of the Assyrian discipline are from the neighbourhood of Judah—Gezer is only twenty miles distant from Jerusalem—two of them are from Judah itself: the visit of Manasseh to Babylon and the employment of Jewish auxiliaries in the Assyrian army. Moreover, the inclusion of Western Asia as well as Egypt within one great Empire, which, besides, contained the still fertile and active centre of ancient civilization, must have meant an extraordinary increase of commerce and mental intercourse all the way from the Tigris to the upper Nile, from the influences of which it was impossible that Judah, a tributary of the Empire, could stand aloof. Hence the establishment at Jerusalem of the Babylonish worship of *the host of heaven*—a worship so elaborate and offered to so many deities that its altars may well have spread, as the Biblical historian affirms, over both of the open courts before the Temple.¹

The host of heaven were the sun, moon and stars, and at this time probably added to the significance of one of the most sacred names of the God of Israel: *Jahweh of Hosts*.³ But as belief in them as separate beings had not died out of Israel—compare the language of even so genuine a monotheist as the author of Deuteronomy iv. 19—it was the more easy to introduce their worship into Jerusalem. The first motive to this was doubtless political. The altars and their rites were among the official expressions of the subjection of the Jewish state to the great Empire, among whose most popular deities was Ishtar, the planet Venus, “the queen of heaven.” But that the mass of the population of Jerusalem succumbed to the attractions of a worship which was openly performed on arenas they were accustomed

¹ See above note, p. 309. ² Deut. iv. 19, xvii. 3.

³ Originally this had meant God of the armies of Israel.

to throng, and with which so many of their native instincts and conceptions of the universe were in sympathy, is proved by the evidence alike of the prophets, the legislators and the annalists of Judah. The Book of Deuteronomy twice specially distinguishes the host of heaven as objects which Israel must not let themselves be drawn away to adore. The site of Jerusalem, high and open to heaven—within view, too, of the long edge of the Moabite plateau over which the moon and the planets rise with impressive majesty—was particularly suitable for a worship conducted in the open air, without idols, by direct adoration of its heavenly objects, and by offerings so simple as to be within reach of the poorest worshippers. Accordingly Jeremiah and Zephaniah both record the spread of the cult of the host of heaven from the courts of the Temple to the house-tops in Jerusalem¹; and the former describes the domestic preparations, in which the whole family, children, fathers and mothers engaged, of *cakes* to the Queen of Heaven,² and the cakes are called by a name borrowed from the Assyrian. In recounting Josiah's reforms the annalist says,³ *he put down . . . them that offered unto the sun, the moon, the mazzālōth and all the host of heaven . . . and he took away the horses that the kings of Judah had set up for the sun at the entrance of the house of Jahweh, by the*

¹ Jer. xix. 13; Zeph. i. 5.

² Jer. vii. 18, cf. xlv. 15 ff. Stade's contentions (*ZATW*, 1886, 123 ff., 286 ff.), following the hint of the Massoretic vocalization of מְלִכָּה הַשָּׁמַיִם, that מְלִכָּה is an abstract noun signifying *dominion* or *governing powers* of heaven; or an abbreviation for מְלִאכָה *work*, and in either case an equivalent of the name *host of heaven*, has been generally rejected by Assyrian and Hebrew scholars (e.g. Schrader, *Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie*, iii. 353, ff.; iv. 74 ff.; Kuenen, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (Budde's tr. 186 ff.); G. F. Moore, *Enc. Bibl.* 3992 f.; Zimmern, *KAT*, 3rd ed. 441). Ishtar is the "queen of heaven," *sharrat shamē* in Assyrian; the Hebrew name for the cakes offered to this deity in Jerusalem מִנִּי is the same word as that for those offered to Ishtar in Babylonia, *kamānu* (Zimmern, *loc. cit.*),

³ 2 Kings xxiii. 5, 11, 12.

chamber of Nathan-melech the chamberlain, which was in the precincts, and he burned the chariots of the sun with fire, and the altars which were on the roofs,¹ and the altars which Manasseh had made in the two courts of the house of Jahweh. *Mazzālōth* is the same word as the Babylonian *manzaltu*. They were either the twelve signs of the zodiac or the divine "stations" in the heavens.² The horses and chariot of the sun were also borrowed from Babylonia.³ In this case also there had been an ancient worship near Jerusalem, the instincts of which had probably not died out of her mixed population and would now spring to welcome its Babylonian analogy. In the fourteenth century Abd. Khiba's letters from Jerusalem mention, as within the territory of the City, a place called Bit Ninib, "house of Ninib," a Babylonian deity regarded as solar.⁴

To the same Assyrian influences we may assign the change which appears soon after this in the Jewish system of dating the year. In earlier times the Israelite year had been the agricultural; it began, as appears from the oldest stratum of the legislation, with the end of autumn and the fall of the early rains.⁵ But in the latest legislation and other post-exilic literature we find a system of reckoning

¹ The following phrase, *the upper chamber of Ahaz*, is from its ungrammatical connection with what precedes obviously a gloss. *The roof* is usually taken to be that of the Temple, but it may well be a collective for the *roofs* from which the domestic worship of the host of heaven took place. In that case the next clause *which the Kings of Judah had made* would be part of the gloss. In itself the plural *kings* raises doubts.

² Zimmern, *KAT*, 3rd ed. 628.

³ *Id.* 368 ff.

⁴ *Id.* 411. Cf. Budde on Judg. i. 34 f., Mount Heres (הַר הָרִים or עִיר־הָרִים, Moore, *Enc. Bibl.* 2019), where he proposes to identify Bit Ninib with Beth-Shemesh; while Moore suggests that Heres is a "Hebraised form of Uraš, a synonym of the Ass. god Ninib, who is primarily the fierce morning sun (see Jensen, *Kosmol.* 458)"; and connects Heres with "the gate Harsith," Jer. xix. 2.

⁵ The autumn feast, the last of the annual series of festivals, is dated at the *outgoing of the year* (Ex. xxiii. 16) or at the *year's circuit or revolution* (Ex. xxxiv. 22).

the year, as in the Babylonian calendar, from the spring month. The date of this change is usually assigned to the Exile: "in the Exile," says Professor Marti, "comes in the custom of placing the first month in spring."¹ Yet this custom was already employed by the scribe Baruch. In the narrative of Jeremiah's dictation of the roll of his prophecies, Baruch says he read this in the Temple in the ninth month of the fourth year of Jekoiakim, which was a winter month.² There is no reason for supposing that these data of the narrative are due to an exilic editor.³ Taking them as Baruch's own, we see that the influence of the Assyrian administration during Manasseh's reign extended so far as to impose upon Jewish scribes the Babylonian system of dating the year.⁴

Jerusalem, then, was permeated during Manasseh's reign by the astral worship of Babylonia, which did not merely obtain, for political reasons, a station in the royal sanctuary, but found an eager welcome from many ancient and popular instincts, still unsubdued by the progress of monotheism, and which became domesticated in shapes that long outlived the drastic reforms of Josiah.

But Manasseh also encouraged the revival of the Canaanite idolatries, which Hezekiah had removed: the worship of the Baalim and the graven image of the Asherah, with the use of the pillars and the Asheroth, and the practice of sacrificing children by fire. When we wonder that such a recrudescence of idolatry could happen so speedily after Hezekiah's reforms, we must recall the congenital heathenism of Jerusalem on which Ezekiel insists; the prevalence of these forms of idolatry all round Judah, and especially in Samaria; and also the probable additions to

¹ *Enc. Bibl.*, col. 5366.

² Jer. xxxi. 9 and 22; cf. xli. 1.

³ So Marti would dispose of them: *loc. cit.*

⁴ Another effect of the Assyrian administration may perhaps be found in the registry of the sale of land recorded in Jer. xxxii.

the city's population both from the Judæan towns devastated by Sennacherib in which Canaanite forms of worship still survived, from the Philistine and Phœnician cities that had suffered by the campaigns of Asarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, and from the great increase of trade under the Assyrian lordship of all Western Asia.

From all sides, then, the monotheism proclaimed by Isaiah and established by Hezekiah was, within a few years from their deaths, assailed by forms of polytheism which enjoyed the support both of the supreme political power and of the most ancient popular instincts. We see clearly that the historians and prophets¹ have not exaggerated the extreme perils of Manasseh's reign to the higher religion of Israel, upon the only stage upon which it was now possible for that religion to persist. Between them, the Assyrian devastation of Judah and the reforms of Hezekiah had tended to confine the worship of Jahweh to Sion. And now, without having any longer behind it that rural population which we have seen rally to its support in previous crises of its betrayal by its royal patrons, we find the higher faith of Israel exposed within its own courts and sanctuary to the invasion of rival forms of worship enforced by the policy of a great Empire and welcomed by the ancient instincts of more than half of the population about it.

Its adherents did not yield without a struggle; but Manasseh met them with the sword. *He shed*, says the historian, *innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from mouth to mouth* of her savage appetite, and Jeremiah testifies that her population was with him; *because they have forsaken me . . . and filled this place with the blood of innocents.*² It is a strange thing that there is no echo of this in the Book of Deuteronomy, the writers of which are nowhere troubled by the problems of the suffer-

¹ Cf. Jer. xv. 1, etc.

² Jer. xix. 4.

ings of the righteous. But the problem had come to stay. By its statement in lines of blood upon her streets Jerusalem was matriculating in a profounder school of religion than that through which Isaiah had brought her, and by her sufferings at the hands of her own sons was learning a lesson more useful for her mission to humanity than even that which her great deliverance from the foreign oppressor had stamped upon her mind. For through all these savage cruelties the remnant of the true people of God remained loyal, and was purified. The times forbade the appearance of public prophets. Persecution drove their faith to anonymous methods of expression,¹ to the secret treasuring of earlier prophecies, perhaps also to the codifying of the social and religious teaching of these, the results of which were hidden away in the Temple against the recurrence of happier times,² and certainly to more spiritual and personal communion with their God. While the majority of her people gave way to the heathen customs and rites which Manasseh had introduced, and delivered to the next generation a number of men and women with heathen names, there were still many families in Jerusalem who feared the Lord, and, as we see from the genealogies of the prophets in Isaiah's reign, dedicated their children to His Name. Nor did they fail to learn from their oppressors and from the systems of belief which threatened to destroy their own. The Babylonian religion had nothing ethical to teach to the disciples of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. But, if we may judge from the subsequent use of Babylonian literature in the cosmogonies and psalms of Israel, there entered her religion at this time from that foreign source new impressions of the order and processes of the universe and new reminiscences of the beginnings of history and civilisation, all of which the Spirit of her God enabled her

¹ E.g. "Micah," vi. 6-8.

² 2 Kings xxii. 8 ff.

to use for His glory and to interpret in the light of those purposes of grace and righteousness which He had long revealed to her. So that the Assyrian dominance of Jerusalem during Manasseh's reign was not altogether for loss to the higher religion, against which it provoked so cruel a reaction. While it purified faith by the sufferings it imposed, it fertilised the intellect of the people, trained them in observation of the universe, and may even have developed their habits of writing and recording.

We have already touched on a number of probable reasons for a considerable increase in the population of the city since 701: the devastation of the rest of the land in that year,¹ Hezekiah's attempt to centralise the national worship, the peace of Jerusalem during the long reign of Manasseh, while neighbouring lands were harried by Assyrian armies, the introduction of the Babylonian cults, and the increase of trade across Western Asia.

For the large share, which Jerusalem took in the trade of Palestine during the seventh century, we have three independent testimonies. First, there is the number of commercial regulations in the Book of Deuteronomy, as contrasted with their absence from the earlier legislation.² Second, there is the epithet, *gate of the peoples*, applied to Jerusalem, by Ezekiel³ in his description of Tyrian commerce. And third, there is the reason, which the king of Persia gave, when he forbade the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem in the time of Zerubbabel: *there have been mighty kings over Jerusalem . . . and tribute, custom and toll was paid unto them.*⁴ Not only, therefore, had Judah developed in the eighth century a considerable commerce among her own people and between them and their neigh-

¹ Compare the parallel case during Nebuchadnezzar's invasion, Jer. xxxv. 11.

² For details see § 54 of "Trade and Commerce" by the present writer in the *Encycl. Biblica*, column 5175.

³ xxxvi. 2.

⁴ Ezra iv. 20.

bours ; but she commanded as well a transit trade, probably between Phœnicia and Edom and Arabia. The political rank of Jerusalem secured to her the chief market of the former along with the tolls and custom-duties of the latter, and thus in spite of the commercial disadvantages of her site she must have become an important and wealthy emporium.

From all these causes the City must have grown ; probably the incomers were largely accommodated in the new quarters of which we first hear from Zephaniah. But the circuit of the walls was not widened. No achievement of this kind is attributed to Manasseh. The Chronicler, drawing upon a source which there is no reason to doubt, tells us that he built an outer wall to the City of David on the steep slope *to the west of Gihon in the valley* of the Kidron, and that it extended *to the entrance of the Fish Gate* which lay on the north. *He compassed about Ophel and raised it up a very great height.*¹ The only other topographical notice is that of Manasseh's burial. Hezekiah is the last king said to have been buried in the sepulchres of the kings. They laid Manasseh *in the garden of his own house, the garden of Uzza or Uzziah*. Here also his son Amon was buried after a reign of little over one year in the same spirit as his father. These and perhaps Josiah's are the graves of the kings which Ezekiel describes as too near the sacred precincts of the Temple.² Was the new site for the royal burials due to some of the novel religious ideas introduced by Manasseh ?

From 701 Jerusalem began to assume that excessive predominance in Judah which gradually rendered the rest of the country but its fringe. We shall see this in several of Jeremiah's allusions. Meantime it is perhaps worth noting that Manasseh is described by Asarhaddon as king not of the land, but "of the City, of Judah."

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

¹ 2 Chron. xxxiii. 14.

² Ezekiel xiii. 7-9.

THE LORD REIGNED FROM THE TREE.

IN the tenth verse of the ninety-fifth (ninety-sixth) Psalm it is written, "Tell it out among the heathen that the Lord reigned from the tree." So, at least, we are assured by the respectable authority of Justin, philosopher and martyr of the second century. But no current text or version of the Psalm now contains the words, and they linger only in the hymn, *Vexilla Regis*. Only the Greek Church keeps the Septuagint, which was the Bible of the early Christian Church; and its most ancient authorities—thanks to the learned labours of Origen—lend no countenance to this and other additions. The rest of Christendom prefers one or other version of the *Hebraica veritas*, as authorized by post-Christian Jewish scholars. Yet the Septuagint prepared the way for the Gospel "by written teaching as John Baptist by vocal," and stood for Scripture to all Greeks and Hellenist Jews who embraced Christianity from the beginning up to the time of Origen—and after. And if the history of early Christianity is to be deciphered faithfully, the vagaries of this ancient version must be studied not merely in the post-Hexaplaric form presented by the great uncials, but also in the quotations of early Christian writers, in the fragments of the Old Latin, as it stood before Jerome and in the late Greek cursives. For Textual Criticism is an indispensable ally of History. The variations which a secretary makes in the copy of a document are surer and more illuminating evidence of his character than the formal testimonials which are often written as well for publication as in good faith.

It is possible to reconstruct the sub-Apostolic age from the writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers, especially since Barnabas and Hermas have been admitted to their

company. These heroes of the time are not entirely removed from the Christian *vulgus*. Pious hands may drape their images with golden robes to match their golden parts, but one can see that their feet are of clay: though they wear aureoles on their heads, they stand upon the common earth as saints and yet as men among men. There were others who left no name behind them—more typical of their fellows, because they did not overtop them. Some of these were scribes who handed down to their successors the written revelation of God orally or in writing. A careful examination of their variations from real or recognized standards enables one to reconstruct the ordinary Christian evangelist—*ex pede Herculem*—and so supplement what is learned from the publications of his greater contemporaries.

Again, it is to be noted that this Septuagint was not of Christian origin. If we could anywhere find the real original, it might throw light upon pre-Christian Judaism. But for Josephus its internal history is a blank profound, peopled chiefly with Apocryphal phantoms, shifting and shifty witnesses to the life of their unknown time, who change their shape like Proteus before each new inquisitor, and show now the Jewish and now the Christian badge.

Before the discussion of this proscribed Scripture is begun it may be necessary to justify this magnifying of the office of Textual Criticism by an example. The only modern witness to the words *from the tree* is the hymn of Venantius Fortunatus, which is included in the Roman Breviary *Sabbato ante Dominicam Passionis*:—¹

Vexilla Regis prodeunt
Fulget Crucis mysterium
Quo carne carnis Conditor
Suspensus est patibulo . . .
Impleta sunt quæ concinit
David fidelis carmine

¹ I owe the reference to my wife; the punctuation *dicens*: . . . is interesting.

Dicens: in nationibus
Regnavit a ligno Deus.

There are many English versions of this hymn, but all in popular use appear to omit the verse which speaks of this apocryphal prophecy as now fulfilled. Yet the whole point of the opening couplet is simply *the Lord reigned from the tree*. This omission suggests an anti-Apocryphal or an anti-Roman bias in the translators, a determination to follow at least the English Authorized Version of the Hebrew Old Testament and to omit and disguise everything which does not there find a guarantee.

But Justin said that the words belonged to the true text of the Psalm, and that they had been cut out by the Jews.

Eusebius, in his account of the extant writings of Justin Martyr,¹ lays most stress upon, and devotes most space to, the dialogue against the Jews, which he describes as the record of an actual encounter between the Christian apologist and Tryphon, the most eminent Hebrew of the time, in the city of Ephesus. "Here," he says, [Justin] "explains how the grace of God led him to the word of the Faith, what zeal he had brought to the study of philosophy, and how earnestly he had sought for the truth.

"He tells also in the same work of the Jewish conspiracy against the teaching of the Christ, attacking Trypho thus: 'Not only did ye not repent of your misdeeds: nay, ye chose out chosen men from Jerusalem at the time and sent them forth into all the earth, saying that a godless sect of Christians had appeared and setting down those accusations, which are brought against us by all who know us not; so that ye are cause of unrighteousness not only to yourselves but also to all the rest of mankind.'

"He writes also that up to his time prophetic gifts were

¹ *Historia Ecclesiae*, iv. 18.

still shining upon the Church. He has quoted the Apocalypse of John, saying clearly that it is [the work] of the Apostle. Moreover, he mentions certain prophetic sayings, and refutes Tryphon, alleging that the Jews cut them out from the Scripture."

The points which Eusebius selects from the dialogue as of special importance are so many proofs of his historical acumen. In this case the document summarized is happily extant—though not quite complete—and the modern scholar restricted to the selection of its most important contributions to the history of Christianity could hardly improve upon the choice of Eusebius. The philosopher who persisted in the search for truth with a single mind and found it in Christianity is typical figure of his age. In a virtue of his previous training Justin and others like him stepped at once into the fighting-line. Christianity was fighting for its existence. Within the Church the authority of its sacred books—especially the Apocalypse of John—was questioned. Without, Jewish Apostles had always dogged the steps of Christian missionaries, who found, as St. Paul at Rome,¹ that their sect was everywhere spoken against. The controversy with the Jews was of paramount importance for the Church of the second century as for the Churches of the first century. And the court of appeal was the Scriptures of the Old Testament which Jesus of Nazareth fulfilled and many of His later followers ignored. But the attitude of Marcion towards the Old Testament was not approved officially by men of Justin's time and type. To them, as to their Jewish opponents, its writings were a revelation, real if enigmatic, of the will of God, and they were content to accept in practice if not in theory the view that they constituted the standard of perfection by which all other alleged revelations must be judged. Here, at least, they followed their Master in the choice of the necessary

¹ Acts xxviii.

starting-point. Jesus said to the Jewish doctors, *Ye search the Scriptures because in them ye think to have eternal life, and these are they which testify concerning me*, and the Christians had the mind of Jesus the Christ. But Justin was not learned in the subtleties of Jewish exegesis. The champions of the new Israel could not all bend the bow of Ulysses, or wear the panoply of Saul, the Pharisee. Saul, who is also Paul, met the Rabbis on their own ground, as did his Lord, and convicted them from their own original authorities expounded on their own methods. Christians of the second generation were of Gentile extraction for the most part. Confronted by the Jewish missionaries they were incapable of meeting them on their own ground—if only because they could not even read the sacred language. Some, like “Barnabas,” took early refuge in the reiterated assertion that the Scriptures—in Greek belonged to the Christians and not and never to the Jews. When the counsel for the defence thus constituted himself judge, the inevitable result must have been that the prosecutor shut up his tablets with a scornful laugh and left him to enjoy the cheap applause and facile congratulations of his still more ignorant supporters upon his Pyrrhic victory.

But there were others—there are others always—who desired only to teach the truth, and sought earnestly to commend it to others by an appeal to reason and not to an usurped authority. When Justin met the Rabbi Tarphon or Tryphon he treated him with due respect: what is more, he reported the controversy and the other controversies in which he engaged with more than Johnsonian fairness. For the dialogue may well be a somewhat elaborated report of what actually occurred at Ephesus and elsewhere.¹

¹ Even if the Rabbi Tarphon was somewhat elderly at the time, it is easier to suppose that Justin remembered an earlier meeting with him than that he had already become a typical anti-Christian controversialist. For his life and teaching see Bacher, *Agada der Tannaiten*.

But in his conflict with the giant Justin could not trust himself with similar armour and weapons. Like David, he had recourse to the brook, and found there sling-stones meet to his purpose. There were certain prophecies which the Jews had discarded, stones worn and rounded by the gentle persistence of the stream, sayings evolved from Scripture by the anxious care of generations of interpreters, who desired only to follow out and open up the revelation of the wisdom of God. He confronted the Rabbi Tarphon with the *glossae* of some unknown pre-Christian Rabbis. The Scriptures proved generally—as Tryphon admitted—that the Christ must suffer before He reigned. But Justin needed a particular and explicit prophecy of the Crucifixion, and he found it.

His assertion that the words, “The Lord reigned from the tree,” actually stood in Psalm xcv. (xcvi.) 10 is at first sight preposterous. That he made it in good faith is not to be questioned. The conclusion that he was misled by some Christian book of proof-texts only transfers the charge of wilful perversion of Scripture to some earlier apologist. Are the crucial words *from the tree* a Christian interpolation, as modern scholars incline to believe?¹ Or was Justin justified in saying that they stood in pre-Christian Jewish texts and were excised by anti-Christian zeal, which here, at least, could wear the mask of pure scholarship?

The former view is certainly attractive. To a Christian the words are eloquent. Jesus said, “I, if I be lifted up out of the earth, will draw all men unto Me.” His followers thought at first that He referred merely to the manner of His death: later that he spoke of His glorious Resurrection and Ascension. At last they realized the essential connexion of the crucifixion itself with the exaltation—saw that the shame constituted and did not merely precede the

¹ See e.g. Swete, *Introduction to O.T. in Greek*, pp. 42, 36; Hennecke, *Handbuch zu N.T. Apocryphen*, *ad. loc.*

glory which was *propter hoc* as well as *post hoc*. Indeed, even Cleopas might have acquiesced in this view of the saying: thanks to Pilate the crucified Jesus enjoyed at least the titular dignity of King of the Jews, and had so far fulfilled the letter of the prophecy.

And yet though it is easy to explain the text as a Christian interpretation which has become an interpolation, such a theory is only admissible when no other can be found. Justin's assertion ought to be allowed to have some weight in the decision of the matter, and it is not so absurd as at first sight appears. Perhaps the canon of the Textual critic, *proclivi lectioni præstat ardua*, has some bearing upon questions of exegesis. It is, indeed, difficult to say what meaning the phrase can have conveyed, but the original was a challenge to the ingenuity of pre-Christian scribes. The guiding principle of their exegesis was to interpret Scripture by Scripture. The great aim of such at any rate as belonged to the Saints or Pharisaic party was to determine the signs and conditions of the restored theocracy. So, for example, the Jewish doctors were ready with their answer to Herod, "The Christ is born in Bethlehem of Judæa . . . for it is written . . ."¹ They pursued this investigation—doubtless with a natural pride in each clever deduction—as if it were an end in itself. Their spirit still survives: others than the Jewish Pharisees might well note the reproof, "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation." Others since then have cried, "Where is the promise of His coming?" in mockery or in anguish.

The textual variations consequent upon such exegesis have mostly been removed by various revisers—the Masoretes, Origen and Jerome. Few survive except in such remote crannies of Hebrew literature and its progeny as the versions of the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira.

¹ Matt. ii. 4 ff.

It remains to reconstruct the process by which these words were added; and if it seem that the theory is far-fetched, it is to be remembered that Jewish exegesis was impatient of the obvious. Its exponents vied with one another in deducing additional truths from the most unpromising material, things new and old from the storehouse of Scripture. In order to understand such a verse as this, or indeed the bulk of the New Testament, one must read the Talmud to the best of one's ability and as much of it as can be compassed.¹ Exegetes are conservative in their methods; and if we can apply the methods of Rabbinic exegesis to the Scripture in question, so as to arrive at the known result, some plausibility may be credited to the theory which is content to accept the assertion of Justin. To do this one must try to get admission to a Beth Hammidrash—a Jewish Theological School—of the first or second century B.C.

It is written, "Tell it out among the nations that the Lord is king." This message is obviously of importance to those waiting for the kingdom, but as it stands it affords no clue to guide them, and is only a truism. In cases like this the Rabbis were apt to ask questions, the answers to which, supplied from the context or other passages of Scripture, served to define the meaning. One might ask, for example, "Over what does God reign?" The context suggests various answers, all of which were perhaps put forward in the discussion which we imagine to have taken place. One Rabbi said, perhaps, "*Over the Gentiles*," for to them is the message sent. Another, "*Over Israel*"—*over the gods of the nations*—and so forth, until one said "*Over the tree*," for it is said, "*All the trees of the wood shall exult before the Lord, for He cometh.*" And the Master of the House of Learning said, as Rabban Jochanan

¹ My own guides in such exploration have been Taylor, Bacher, Dalman, and Fiebig.

ben Zakai¹ often said of Eleazar ben Arucq, "I approve the words of Rabbi rather than your words, for his words include your words. Read not, then, *the Lord reigneth*, but *the Lord reigned over the tree*."

So far we have changed the preposition, and offered no elucidation of the disputed clause beyond the suggestion that it is derived from another verse of the same Psalm.

The first point is easily disposed of. Apart from its citation by Justin and Tertullian, the phrase actually occurs in one document, which is at least not nominally Christian—a cursive Psalter: there, however, it is read, ἀπὸ τῷ ξύλῳ. Of all transcriptional variants in Greek MSS. that of ἀπό for ἐπὶ is among the commonest. The dative, of course, calls for ἐπὶ and not ἀπό, and no one who has handled many cursive manuscripts would hesitate to accede to its just demand. The reward of this concession is immediate and ample. ἐπὶ τῷ ξύλῳ will be in Hebrew עַל עֵץ, and we have at once a good Hebrew idiom and a meaning—or want of meaning—for the text, which does not compel us to regard it as necessarily Christian. The variation כַּעַל for עַל or ἀπό for ἐπὶ may be a Christian emendation or pure accident: in either case it was necessary to enforce the Christian identification of "the Lord" with Jesus. The tense of the Greek ἐβασίλευσε, *reigned* for *reigns*, of the Hebrew may again be Christian; and, as the Septuagint has it, it is not altogether impossible that the disputed words stood in the original Septuagint, and were expunged in the Hexaplaric revision. Lastly, this emendation agrees with the words of the Epistle of Barnabas viii.: *the reign or kingdom of Jesus is upon the tree*.

But to reach the meaning which the words conveyed to the Rabbi who suggested, and his master who endorsed them, we must go back to the school and try to hear more of the discussion. In defence of his verdict we may

¹ *Sayings of the Fathers*, ii. 10 ff., ed. Taylor, pp. 33 ff.

imagine the master cited an ancient parable: "Is it not written in the book of Judges that after the death of Jerubbaal, who is Gideon—whom God sent to deliver and to judge His people as Samuel¹ testified—Abimelech persuaded the foolish Shechemites to make him king?" The true sons of Jerubbaal were all slain except Jotham. *And when they told it to Jotham he . . . lifted up his voice and . . . said unto them . . . The trees went forth to anoint a king over them: and they said unto the olive tree, Reign thou over us . . . and the trees said to the fig tree, Come thou and reign over us . . . then said the trees unto the vine, Come thou and reign over us . . . then said all the trees unto the bramble, Come thou and reign over us. And the bramble said unto the trees, If in truth ye anoint me king over you, then come and put your trust in my shadow. . . .*

"That parable was spoken to fit a certain time and place; but, as it is contained in Scripture, it must be a parable for the present time also, eternally valid and permanently instructive. The trees for Jotham were the children of Israel, who sought to have an earthly king, forgetting that the only King of Israel is God, that human rulers are only usurpers who hold sway for a time, and then perish with their dynasties. Therefore good men refuse for the most part to reign over Israel as kings, and they have recourse to Abimelech, and later to Saul and his degenerate successors. Many brambles have reigned over the trees of the wood: *except David, Hezekiah, and Josiah all the kings of Judah and Israel sinned and made their people sin.* Israel, then, is the tree, as it is written, *Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt: thou hast cast out the heathen and planted it . . . and it filled the land . . . the boughs thereof were like the goodly cedars.*² The tree has been burned,³ as Jotham foretold: to Egypt succeeded Assyria

¹ 1 Samuel xii. 11; whence Heb. xi. 32 classes with the heroes of faith Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, and so corrects the Masoretic text of Samuel, *l.c.*

² Ps. lxxix. (lxxx.) 8 ff.

³ *Id.* 16.

and Syria as her oppressors. But the promise, *the Lord reigneth over the tree*, is sure. At the last He will disperse all other rulers and manifest His present and eternal sovereignty.

Again, the tree may stand for the oppressors of Israel as well as for Israel itself. It is written in the book of the prophet Ezekiel, *Behold the Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon . . . his stature was exalted above all the trees of the field . . . The cedars in the garden of God could not hide him : the fir trees were not like his boughs, and the plane trees were not as his branches, nor was any tree in the garden of God like unto him in his beauty. I made him fair by the multitude of his branches : so that all the trees of Eden that were in the garden of God envied him.*¹ The ruler of the earth was a great tree ; yet God shall bring him low, and at his fall God says, *I caused Lebanon to mourn for him and all the trees of the field fainted for him.*² And then again God speaks to Egypt, *To whom art thou thus like in glory and in greatness among the trees of Eden ? yet shalt thou be brought down with the trees of Eden unto the nether parts of the earth. . . . This is Pharaoh and all his multitude, saith the Lord God.*

It is written, God created the heavens and the earth and all that is therein ; and again it is written, God planted a garden in Eden. The trees of the garden are the nations of the world and the tree of life, which shall re-appear only in the future age, is for the healing of the nations. There are trees meanwhile which rise above the height of other trees—nations which spring up to rule the other nations of the world. Yet all the shifting fortunes of world-empires are in the hand of Him who raiseth up and bringeth low. Assyria and Egypt are both alike in their turn, the tree over which Jehovah reigns.

¹ Ezek. xxxi. 3-8.

² *Ib.* 15.

The image serves the same purpose in the book of the prophet Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar saw a dream which made him afraid. *I saw and behold a tree in the midst of the earth, and the height thereof was great . . . and behold a watcher and an holy one came down from heaven. He cried aloud and said thus, Hew down the tree. . . . The sentence is by the decree of the watchers and the demand by the word of the holy ones to the intent that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men and giveth it to whomsoever He will, and setteth up over it the lowest of men. . . . Then David, whose name was Belteshazzar, . . . answered and said . . . The tree that thou sawest . . . it is Thou, O king, that art grown and become strong.*

What is this but to say again, *the Lord reigned over the tree?*

And if one say the Lord reigned over the idols, the gods of the nations, is it not written that *they are wood (וץ) and stone, the work of men's hands?*

Surely the word of this unknown Rabbi includes all other words which can describe the subjects of God's reign.

The passage quoted from Ezekiel suggests the account of the garden of Eden as the source of the figure. The special application of it to the tree which from time to time overshadowed the rest, the dominant world-power, was replaced by the more natural and general use which appears to be established in New Testament times. To John Baptist and to Jesus all who heard their preaching were *trees* who must bear fruit of repentance and good works or perish. St. Paul is led to contemplate also the wild olive—the tree which the Pharisee reckoned to be outside God's garden.

So then it seems not unreasonable to suppose that the text as Justin read it embodied a safeguard or definition of Scripture, a fence to Torah, such as "the men of the Great

Synagogue " were careful to raise.¹ The great questions of human free-will and Divine government of the universe were eagerly and anxiously discussed by Pharisees and Sadducees before Christ as by Gnostic and Catholic Christians. God's sovereignty must not be limited to its final manifestation: as the Pharisees taught, it is being exercised now, though men thwart it or seem to thwart it. This reference also would naturally be discussed.

The traditional explanation would not be written down in the Synagogue rolls, though it may have crept into Greek or Aramaic Targums, or collections of Testimonia based upon them. When crucifixion was introduced into Palestine and the word *tree* acquired more and more closely the sinister connotation, the expression grated upon the ears of the pious Jews. It was a greater stumbling-block than the Christian watchword *a crucified Messiah*, as it might be held to speak of a crucified Jehovah. The Jews then repudiated it. But it was nevertheless reserved for "a life beyond life." What better summary could there be of the teaching of St. Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews?² What sermons the early Christian missionaries could draw from it! The accursed tree was now, more plainly than "the lofty tree" of the Old Testament, the fit emblem of the oppressor of God's people. The Lord reigned over it, triumphed over the powers of the world, over death in its most shameful form. And thus triumphant He reigned from it. What better charge could be given to the missionary than this—"Go: tell it out among the heathen that the Lord reigned from the tree"?

Thanks to some converted pupil of the Rabbis the verse thus transformed found its way into the handbooks of Messianic prophecies fulfilled in the life and death of Jesus of Nazareth. It is true that Trypho was justified in saying that it did not occur in the original. Some of its com-

¹ *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, init.

² See e.g. Phil. ii.; Heb. ii. 9.

panions preserved in the First Gospel are equally *things which are not*; and they are equally genuine products of the development of Jewish thought, which prepared the way for Christianity and immediately preceded its advent. When they had in the land of Israel the proverb, "The days are prolonged and every vision faileth," the teachers turned to seek for wonderful things in the Law, and thus inspired by their study they produced the body of Apocalyptic and Apocryphal literature. So far as this is pre-Christian it is apt to be regarded as Christian—along with our text. But all the evidence of the New Testament tends to show that the legend about James the Just reflects the real state of the case—that, apart perhaps from the questions of publicans and Gentiles the teaching of Jesus and the Christianity of St. Paul had much in common with the best Pharisaic teaching of the time. The "Pharisees who believed" only added to their doctrine the fact that their Hope had been realized—or rather would be realized at the Parousia. The modern conventional idea of the *Second Coming* represents a later stage of Christian thought, and is no more true to history than the modern identification of all the Pharisees of the time with the hypocrites denounced by Jesus and the Rabbis. Hegesippus' story of James, the brother of our Lord, provides a fine corrective to such injustice.

"He was styled 'the Just' by all men from the times of the Lord unto our own. For many were called James; but he was holy from his birth. Wine and strong drink he drank not, nor did he eat any living thing. No razor came up upon his head: he did not anoint himself with oil nor use a bath. He alone was suffered to enter into the Holy Place. . . . There in the Temple he was found upon his knees asking remission for the people, so that his knees became hard like a camel's because he was always kneeling in worship of God and asking remission for the people."

Whatever legendary accretions may be distinguished in this narrative, what has been quoted does not go far beyond

the description of the early Christians at the beginning of Acts, when they were rightly regarded as a sect of the Jews distinguished by their exceptional piety. St. Paul himself said after the disruption, "I would be accursed and bereft of the Christ for the sake of my brethren who are Israelites, whose is the sonship and the glory and the covenants and the law and the worship and the promises, whose are the fathers, from whom is the Christ by fleshly descent, whose is the Lord of all,¹ God blessed for ever." The account of the trial of St. Paul before the Sanhedrin shows how far the Messianic Hope outweighed all other considerations with the Pharisees. So the Lawyers, like the Law, were man's pedagogue till Christ came, and made ready for His coming; and this though Christians were ready to take their sayings wiselier than they were meant. Scripture and the circumscription thereof, Torah and the fence of Torah were baptized into Christ. The Old Testament became the Bible of the Early Church. The Lord's own Law they reserved as a pearl too precious to be put before the heathen. Soon indeed they themselves possessed only a translation of those words which else they might have worshipped, forgetful of the quickening Spirit of His life, a reflexion of the Letter which else might have paralysed their thoughts and activities, like the fabled head of Medusa.

When the new Israel was redeemed from the new Egypt, which is the old Israel, they too went out laden with spoils and exulting. The Greek Scriptures, canonical and apocryphal, alike needed little alteration to fit them for new uses. Some of the golden ornaments were melted down to make a golden calf when the people clamoured for the old gratifications of licensed or unlicensed knowledge. Others again passed straight to nobler uses like this tradition of the Jewish elders, wherein to the Christian the crucified Christ was apparent and not merely latent:—

The Lord reigned from the tree.

J. H. A. HART.

¹ Rom. ix. 1 ff. I venture to suggest this simple solution of a notorious difficulty:—Read not $\delta\ \acute{\omega}\nu$. . . but $\acute{\omega}\nu\ \delta$. . .

JERUSALEM AND DEUTERONOMY.

CIRCA 638-608 B.C.

DURING the reign of Manasseh (*circa* 685-639) the land of Judah recovered from the devastation of 701. What became of the 200,000 captives, whom Sennacherib claims to have taken¹—how many he carried to Assyria and how many his sudden departure obliged him to leave behind—we do not know. But it is certain that of those and of others who had fled before him into Jerusalem not all returned, and that the rural economy was radically disturbed. An invasion such as Sennacherib inflicted on Judah—and its drastic character is emphasized by Isaiah²—is followed not merely by the transference of estates from some families to others. It happens almost always that lands formerly preserved by many individuals pass into the hands of a few, and only seldom that the domains of a slain or a banished landlord are divided among his serfs or adherents. But all such disturbances consequent upon 701 must have been gradually repaired. The long peace of Manasseh's reign, with its prosperity,³ and the revival under royal patronage of the local cults, must have restored to the country much of its appearance before Sennacherib's invasion. The rural population was again large. About 625 Jeremiah at Anathoth saw shrines all over the land—*as many as thy cities so be thy gods, O Judah; where hast thou not been defiled?*⁴—and heard across it the noise of much people.⁵ Nor was this part of the nation without considerable moral force. Of the second group of Judean prophets half—Jeremiah himself and Nahum—came from villages, and, as we shall see, the Deuteronomic legislation is strongly

¹ See above, p 220.

² Ch. i.

³ See above, 319.

⁴ Jer. ii. 28, iii. 2; cf. iii. 9, xi. 13, etc.

⁵ Jer. iii. 21, (?) 23 ff., etc.

influenced by provincial interests. The capital, of course, retained its lead, but when a party of officials slew Amon, son of Manasseh, it was *the people of the land*¹ who executed the murderers, and, as in the case of Uzziah, raised the murdered man's son to the throne.

The motives of the intrigue against Amon are not clear. Manasseh's persecutions, apparently confined to Jerusalem, must have created a bitterness against his house, which would naturally become effective under his weaker successor. But the conspiracy is said to have been formed among *the servants of Amon*, and was therefore more probably due to political opinions, restrained so long as Manasseh lived and there was no practical alternative to the Assyrian supremacy. By the time Manasseh died Psametik of Egypt had thrown off the Assyrian yoke,² and according to a credible tradition was already interfering in south-eastern Palestine.³ The Egyptian party at the court of Jerusalem, which had controlled affairs at the close of the previous century, and, as we know from Jeremiah,⁴ was again active about 625, but lay powerless during the reign of Manasseh, may have sought by the death of Amon to remove the chief obstacle to their policy. Or his courtiers may have had some more private grudge against him. In any case the motives of the conspirators were not economic; their punishment by *the people of the land* proves how contented the latter had been under the government of Manasseh.

There is no evidence that the elevation of Josiah was due to the party of the purer religion, formed by Isaiah.

¹ 2 Kings xxi. 24—not of course exclusive of the unofficial classes in Jerusalem.

² "Before 660," Rodgers' *Hist. of Bab. and Assyria*, ii. 254; "It may have been about 660 but this is uncertain," W. Max Müller, *Enc. Bibl.*, art. "Egypt." "Certainly by 645," McCurdy, *Hist. Proph. and the Monuments*, ii. 355.

³ Herodotus, ii. 151.

⁴ Jer. ii. 18, 36.

But from the first that party had included many of the leading men in Jerusalem,¹ and in spite of its decimation by Manasseh, probably still retained some adherents of high rank. After the murder of Amon, the slaughter of the king's *servants*, nominees of Manasseh, may have opened to those influential followers of the prophets some of the offices at court. And it certainly was to the advantage of their principles that the new king was too young to be committed to the policy of Manasseh, and sensitive to other influences. At the age of eight he was chiefly under the care of the women of the household; and through them, or some of his ministers or some of the priests, his character, on which so much depended, was moulded by the principles of his great-grandfather, Hezekiah. There must also have been sober and conservative men, whose minds, though not appreciating the spiritual teaching of the prophets, revolted against the foreign cults and the cruelties of Manasseh, and who would be ready to welcome the restored supremacy of the national God. And there was always the party favourable to Egypt. But so long as the Assyrian domination remained effective—Ashurbanipal had apparently accepted Josiah as his vassal—no one of these parties nor all of them together could carry their desires into action. The Assyrian sovereignty at once awed and divided them. While it remained there would be many who feared it, and some, among the prophetic party, who, following Isaiah, would judge a revolt against it or the appeal to Egypt, which others proposed, as an impious course for the Lord's people to pursue. The various parties could, therefore, only wait and privately prepare,—each in its own way and all by some compromises with each other—for a change in the political situation. Of this there were many omens. The Assyrian Empire, apparently as strong as ever at its centre, was

¹ Smend, *A. T. Religionsgeschichte*.

suffering in its extremities. Egypt was independent, and her forces, increased by Greek and Carian mercenaries, threatened the southern provinces; while swift and terrible hordes, races new to history, hung over the northern. During the youth of Josiah all the Jews must have gathered hope and courage, but the eyes of their various factions rested upon different rifts in the horizon. At last in 625, with the death of Ashurbanipal, a gate was suddenly flung open wide enough for all of them to move forward together, and a religious influence descended under which they became for the first time a united nation.

The Editor of the Book of Kings dates the beginning of Josiah's reforms in the eighteenth year of his reign, 621 or 620 B.C. The repair of the Temple which he records before that was a periodical affair instituted by Joash.¹ The Chronicler asserts that the reforms began earlier. He dates the king's adhesion to the purer religion in the eighth year of his reign, and the *commencement* ² of the destruction of the high places and the idols in the twelfth year, and says that the work was complete by the eighteenth when the Temple was repaired and the Book of the Law discovered. But if the king had already achieved such drastic reforms, there was no cause for the consternation ascribed to him when the Book was read. We must therefore prefer the statement in Kings, that the high places and idols began to be removed *after* the discovery of the Book. Still the definite dates given by the Chronicler, when read in the light of the history of the time, suggest that he worked upon reliable material. The eighth

¹ Erbt, *Die Sicherstellung des Monotheismus durch die Gesetzgebung im vorexil. Juda* (1903), assumes that Josiah ordered a reconstruction (Umbau) of the Temple, and illustrates, what he believes must have followed from this on the discovery of its foundation stone and the documents of its constitution (Urkunde), from Babylonian parallels. But there is no evidence of so thorough a rebuilding.

² Josiah began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places, the Asherim, the graven images, etc., 2 Chron. xxxiv. 2 ff.

year of Josiah's reign was the sixteenth of his life, when it is reasonable to suppose that his character was formed and that he began to assert himself. And the twelfth year of his reign is 626 or 625, the year of Ashurbanipal's death, which, as we have seen, left Judah free to govern herself. We may therefore infer that with the gradual growth of opportunity, as depicted above, the stages of the movement under Josiah were three. *First*, there was the king's adolescence and his adhesion to the purer religion. Whatever influences brought it about, the personal fact is too well credited to remain doubtful. Between the kings who preceded and those who followed him Josiah stands by himself, and we need not hesitate to ascribe to him, as both his historians do, that power of personality which it is so easy but so fallacious to ignore in religious movements. *Second*, there were some tentative efforts at reform after 625, when Ashurbanipal's death gave Josiah and his counsellors political freedom; but the king and all the parties may have been too dazzled by the sudden opportunity and too much at variance among themselves to effect a decisive change. *Third*, in 621 or 620, a sacred Law-Book was discovered in the Temple which not only did justice in its details to the various national interests, but by its general spirit impressed all their representatives with the awe of a supreme religious obligation.¹ It is this religious influence, gathered from the

¹ Erbt (*op. cit.*) and Dr. John Cullen (*The Book of the Covenant in Moab a critical enquiry into the original form of Deuteronomy*, Glasgow, Maclehose, 1903) both do justice, upon the Chronicler's data, to the gradual character of the movement. Cullen (p. 17): "The author of Kings has telescoped into one account a series of reforms." Erbt (p. 8) places the first stage at the accession of Josiah, but, as we have seen, there is no evidence that this was due to the spiritual party in Judah; and does not accept as reliable the Chronicler's first datum in Josiah's conversion, but takes it as a mere easy assumption that the king's adolescence was marked by his adhesion to the prophetic principles: yet here, as elsewhere, Erbt seems to me to ignore too much the personality of Josiah.

prophets of the eighth century, fostered by loyal hearts under Manasseh, and giving itself forth as divine, to which as it acted on the priests of the Temple, on a king whose character was predisposed to receive it, and through them on the whole people of Judah, at a time when the political situation was favourable to its national enforcement, the great Reform, the establishment of monotheism in Israel, was essentially due. Without the Divine call and the faith of the men who received it, the political situation, the compromises of parties, and the wonderful adaptation of the Law itself to the rival ecclesiastical and social interests would have availed little. The effect upon the nation was immediate and complete. The king was overcome by the denunciations against the negligence of its laws which the Book contained, and further moved by a message from the prophetess Huldah,¹ gathered *the men of Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem* to the Temple and had the Book read in their hearing. Then with due sacrificial forms, and as the representative of the people, he *made a covenant* before God to keep the words of the Book, *and all the people stood to the covenant*.

Very few now doubt that the Book which formed the basis of this national covenant is part, at least, of our present Book of Deuteronomy. Recent attempts to disprove this,² cannot be pronounced successful. The reforms introduced by Josiah in obedience to the discovered Book correspond to the requirements of Deuteronomy as they do not to any of the other codes of Israel, while the distinctive Deuteronomic style and phraseology begin from

¹ 2 Kings xxii. 15-20. Huldah's oracle as here given is probably not in its original form, but the fact that it predicts a peaceful death for Josiah, who fell in battle at Megiddo, is proof that some at least of the original contents have been preserved.

² As, for instance, in *Are the Critics Right?* by Müller. Transl. by Irwin. Rel. Tract Soc., 1903.

this period onward to affect the literature of Israel.¹ But how much of the Book of Deuteronomy existed at the time we cannot say. Some portions of the canonical text are without doubt exilic; and recent criticism has tended to show how composite the rest is by first analysing it, not very successfully,² into a legal code (chaps. xi.-xxvi. with xxviii.), which was the discovered law book, and some hortatory introductions to this; and more recently, upon other linguistic phenomena, into constituents which run through both the legal and the hortatory divisions.³ Accepting one or other of these conflicting principles of analysis, recent writers see in our present Deuteronomy the fusion of two or more editions of the original. It is generally agreed that the discovered Book must have contained some of the minatory passages, for example, chap. xxviii., or at least some of the strong exhortations, because their presence would explain the distress of the king on hearing the Book read. But there is, and probably always will be, a difference of opinion as to whether the hortatory sections by themselves inspired the reforms, and the legislation was its precipitate and codification; or whether the legislation was the actual programme on which the king and the other reformers went to work.⁴ The question is

¹ It is beyond the scope of this article to detail the proofs. See Driver's *Introd. to Deuter.*, and Ryle's and Moore's articles in *Hastings' Bible Dict.* and the *Enc. Bibl.*

² See Driver's strong arguments for the linguistic unity of the hortatory and legal portions.

³ Steuernagel's and Stärck's various analyses, based on a distinction between the singular and plural forms of address, to the principle of which the present writer adhered in a paper read before the Society of Historical Theology at Oxford in 1902. Erbt accepts Steuernagel's analysis.

⁴ As stated above, the latter was formerly the prevailing view. But Dr. Cullen (*op. cit.*) has argued that a large hortatory and historical section, including chapters v. 29-xi. 28, and other passages, to which he gives the name the Book of the Covenant, was the original discovered in the Temple, and that the Law-code was put together in consequence of the reforms. Erbt, following on Steuernagel, distinguishes two codes: one of Hezekiah, which was the basis of reforms in 625, and one of Josiah, which was the basis of the reforms of 621 or 620.

not one within our duty to discuss at the present time. Whatever be the correct analysis of Deuteronomy, and the dates of its various constituents, we may confidently hold that all of these represent the religious spirit which animated Josiah and his people between 625 and 620, and that they detail for us the reforms which were enforced in Judah from the latter year onward.

The Book of Deuteronomy applies the teaching of the eighth century prophets to the life and consuetudinary law of Israel : interpreting the people's history, modifying their institutions, regulating their daily habits, inspiring their individual hearts and minds, and dealing in addition with the latest phenomena of their religious and economic development. The governing principle of the Book is Monotheism, qualified, it is true, by current popular conceptions, and in its applications limited by the practical necessities of the time ; yet so earnestly moral and warmly spiritual in its exposition of the relation between God and the people, that our Lord has accepted one of its central expressions as the supreme law of religion : *Hear, O Israel, Jahweh thy God is one Jahweh, and thou shalt love Jahweh thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.* The worship of every other deity is absolutely forbidden, and, in the spirit of the times, on the penalty of death. Equally excluded is the representation of the Deity in any material form ; and His worship is purged of all immoral elements, *abominations* as they are called : images, *masseboth*, Asherim, all tainted and foolish rites, all mutilations of the body and unclean practices, all witchcraft and necromancy. The whole of the practice of religion is winnowed and ordered by a spirit as certain of its own reasonableness as it is passionately pure and humane.

The distinctive feature of Deuteronomy, however, is the centralization of the national worship. We have already

seen how inevitable a corollary this was to the ethical monotheism of the prophets. The ritual of Israel's religion had always been a menace to its intellectual and moral elements, partly because men are ever disposed to assign to the performance of rites a higher place in the Divine will than morality, and partly because the rites used by Israel were akin to those of the religions around them, and thus constantly tempted the worshippers to confuse the character of their God with those of others. That is why the prophets of the eighth century did not refrain from demanding the abolition of all sacrifice and ritual. Instead of this the practical reformers of the seventh century proposed their limitation to one place, not only in order to secure the purity of the ritual but to avert that dissolution of the Divine Unity which was almost inseparable in the popular mind from the identification of God with many sanctuaries. Therefore besides enforcing the extirpation of the cult of every other god from the land, Deuteronomy decrees the destruction of all the *bamoth* or high places at which Jahweh Himself was worshipped, and confines His sacrifices and the celebration of His feasts to a single sanctuary. Such a measure was not, as some recent writers labour to prove, the invention of any interested locality or corporation of priests, and it could never have been carried out by mere party motives, however powerful or skilfully organized. The removal of the high places was nothing less than a religious and ethical necessity, demanded in the name of the One God, and proved by the bitter experience of centuries. Unless we appreciate this we shall not understand how so great a revolution in the national worship was so unanimously effected in Judah, without opposition from the interests which it disturbed.

But the ideal of the Book is political as well as religious. The establishment of many idolatries in Jerusalem had been the sacramental token of the nation's servitude to a

foreign power. But the Deuteronomic Israel is a free people, owning no overlord save their God, and governing themselves in subjection to His revealed will. His will is applied to every department of the national life—monarchy, war, agriculture, commerce, education, and the relief of the poor, as well as worship—in as comprehensive a system of national religion as the world has ever seen. The duty laid upon the Book of rigorously limiting the national worship to one locality neither shortens its vision of the land nor restrains its heart from the whole compass of the people's life. There is no stage of Israel's legislation from which we enjoy so wide and sympathetic a prospect of land and people. One of the most frequently enforced obligations to love and serve God is His gift of *this land*, whose singular preciousness and beauty is as lavishly described¹ as its sacredness is solemnly proclaimed: *Thou shalt not cause the land to sin which Jahweh thy God giveth thee for an heritage. Thy cities and thy gates* are among the most often recurring formulas by which the laws (except those relating to the central sanctuary) are expressly affirmed as applicable throughout the country, and the laws are designed for a widely scattered people still mainly employed in agriculture.² To this stage of life the blessings and the curses are, with one exception,³ confined, and the happiness of the people is described as in rural wealth and pleasures. It is remarkable how the very fringes of country life are considered—the dropped sheaf, strayed animals, and the like; and also how much care is taken for remote persons and places—for fugitives from blood at a distance from the central sanctuary,⁴ for escaped slaves,⁵ and for the victims of murder and outrage in lonely

¹ xi. 10 ff.

² This even in xiv. 22–29.

³ xxviii. 12, 43 f.

⁴ iv. 41 ff.

⁵ xxiii. 15.

fields far from houses.¹ If the writers belonged to Jerusalem, they did not write from behind her walls. The whole country is upon their conscience and their heart; its cities and village life, farms and homesteads, vineyards, fields and mines, long roads and desert places. One would think that not the law of the central sanctuary, but the interests of the rest of the land were the main anxiety of the Book; so careful, for instance, are its provisions for the priests of the disestablished shrines, and for the domestic convenience of the people in whose gates sacrifice, hitherto the invariable form of the slaughter of animals for food, is no longer to be allowed. Down to small details and to the remotest distances, interests, whether vested or not, are safeguarded, and compensation is made for the disturbance caused to the rural economy by the centralisation of the cultus. But such provisions form only part of the wide and mindful humanity of the Book. Its ethics are the social justice and pure charity of the great prophets. Its care is vigilant for the poor, the widow, the fatherless, the slave and debtor, and the stranger *that is within thy gates*. Nor are the animals forgotten.

Yet the system is limited to Israel. Beyond directions for the admission to the covenant of individual Edomites and Egyptians,² there is no attempt to deal with the world outside. There is no missionary programme, no provision for mankind—that is one of the limitations of the monotheism of the Book, already alluded to. Next to devotion to the national Deity, comes pride in the nation itself: a pride, of course, subject to the austere moral conditions imposed on their life. As there is one Jahweh, so there is one Israel, the only righteous people, and wise above all others. For no other possesses a religion or laws so high

¹ xxi. 1, xxii. 25 ff.

² xxiii. 3-8: against which note the frequent command to extirpate other peoples (e.g. xxv. 17 ff.).

and pure. The intellectual tempers of monotheism—the sense of a loftier mental position, the scorn of idolatry—appear if not in the original Deuteronomy yet in its immediate additions.

It is only when we thus realize all the tempers which inspire Deuteronomy—some of them, it may be, not yet articulate by the date of the Reform, of which parts of the Book were the cause and parts the precipitate—that we can explain the rapid and unanimous adoption of the system by the nation : in spite of the fact that it involved the alteration of so many sacred customs and the disturbance of so many vested interests throughout the land. The religious instincts and natural conscience of the people, headed by their pious king, were stirred. Their patriotism was inflamed, their intelligence aroused, and their affections drawn forth by the humane ideals presented to them. Every home, every heart was appealed to. Every interest found itself respected. Upon the poor and the oppressed a great hope dawned. But to all this volume of movement, the edge and point was the conviction of the zealous leaders of reform, sharpened as it had been by the cruel experiences of Manasseh's reign—the conviction that only such radical and rigorous measures as Deuteronomy enjoins could save their religion from submergence by heathenism, and their nation from destruction. And now for the free operation of all these motives the political situation gave the opportunity which had been denied to the efforts of Hezekiah. Israel was free for the moment from foreign servitude—free to obey its God and to govern itself in His fear.

The Book of Deuteronomy is singularly reticent as to the name of the place which Jahweh would choose for His one altar and sanctuary. Jerusalem is not mentioned, neither in the laws nor in the introductions or supplements. We

¹ And that although the cities of refuge are given by name, and

can hardly doubt the reason of this. The authors of the policy were more concerned to state the religious principle involved in it than to advocate the claims of a particular locality. Nor did the latter need to be asserted. Jerusalem was the only possible candidate for the unique position designated by Deuteronomy. We have seen the gradual growth of Temple and City at a time when they had still many ancient and more powerful rivals in the land. We have seen how Isaiah interpreted the Divine purpose in their history and unveiled their glory as the habitation and the hearth of God, and how this sacredness had been vindicated in 701 when every other sanctuary in the land was despoiled. Nowhere else could the centralized ritual be kept so pure as on a site which, never having been used by another deity before Jahweh chose it for His own, had passed through such a history of divine deed and word. David's, Solomon's, Isaiah's, Hezekiah's work was completed by Josiah, and the Temple became the single sanctuary of the One God.

The record of how Josiah carried out the Deuteronomic reforms¹ is composite, and beset with later intrusions. But it is certain that the Temple, the City and their surroundings were largely purged of heathen altars, rites, and ministries; and that from Geba to Beersheba—the limits of Judah—the high places of Jahweh were abolished, His rural priests brought to Jerusalem, and His sacrifices and festivals established there alone. The former side of the Reform does not appear to have been so successful as the latter. The heathen cults may have ceased for the rest of Josiah's reign, but upon his death they immediately revived. But the centralization of the national worship of Jahweh, the establishment of the one sanctuary

sacred functions are appointed at Ebal and Gerizim the natural centre of the land.

¹ 2 Kings xxiii.

for the One God, was settled once for all. And this was the main thing. Whether cleansed or not from heathen cults, Jerusalem became, not merely the principal school and shrine of the one great system of ethical and intellectual monotheism in the ancient world; but its material sign and sacrament, its only altar, and for centuries almost an equal object with its God of confidence and longing.

While it was thus possible to execute the formal decrees of Deuteronomy with regard to the worship, it was by no means so easy to realize the ethical ideals, and one after another these faded even in Josiah's time. Removed from close contact with the agricultural and pastoral habits of the people, which moulded the cases of the rural shrines, the ritual was relieved from the debasing infections of nature-worship. But at the same time there was danger that the healthy influence of association with the simple life of the common people and their domestic interests would be lost. As a matter of fact the sensuous but naïve credulities of the country were replaced by another materialism. Jeremiah reports that a more sophisticated and tyrannous superstition grew up about the one altar and the letter of the Law on which its ritual was founded. The vivid sympathy which we have seen in Deuteronomy for the whole land and its life was replaced by a fanaticism for the Temple and the City. Even so definite an ordinance as that for the admission of the rural priests to equal office and privilege with those of Jerusalem was ignored. And in general the social legislation of Deuteronomy was neglected. As the prophets complain, the people of Jerusalem learned neither justice nor mercy toward the poor and the slave.

The great influx of rural priests undoubtedly introduced to the capital a measure of moral vigour and independence of thought: witness Jeremiah himself. But it also meant the increase of the number of religious idlers, especially

when those priests were refused admission to the full work and honour of the altar. Divorced more or less from local and domestic interests, deprived of the highest ambitions of their profession, and reduced in many cases to a degrading beggary and subsistence on chance, the Levites were left to develop a narrow and a hollow patriotism without responsibility or healthy discipline. There was thus constituted a body of zealots and fanatics, who are already apparent in the days of Jeremiah and who never ceased in the Temple courts till the days of Titus: men who turned the Temple into a fortress and forgot the rest of their land and its interests.

Thrice every year the manhood of the people gathered to Jerusalem, and what that meant for the national unity and discipline and instruction in great causes cannot be exaggerated. We see it already in Jeremiah's choice of such seasons for the delivery of his prophecies. He could address the whole of Judah in the courts of the Temple. But at the same time these mobs were prone to be as fuel to the false fire of the zealots. Instead of bringing to the capital the health and sanity of the country, they took back to the provinces the fever of the City.

In short, from the very morrow of the Deuteronomic centralization of the cultus in Jerusalem, we see at work all the forces, good and bad, which form the mingled glory and horror of her future history.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

*ICONIUM.*¹

VI. THE RELIGION OF ICONIUM.

THE religion of Iconium was touched on in § I. As is there stated, it is hardly possible to write on any side of city life without alluding to the religion of the city, because its religion is the ideal presentment of its whole existence.

As an old Phrygian city, Iconium had originally been in the closest relation with Zizima and the Phrygian goddess who dwelt there; and though the political relation had been weakened, and Zizima was now through Roman commercial conditions separated from Iconium and connected with Laodiceia, yet the deep-lying religion of the masses in Iconium was the worship of the Mother of Zizima. A large part of the population was Phrygian by race, probably (as we saw) concentrated in one tribe, and thus not exercising voting power according to the constitution in proportion to its numbers, but in the course of centuries gradually asserting the real strength due to its sheer weight and mass, and forcing the Phrygian character of the city into recognition. The revival of the Oriental spirit in the Eastern Provinces during Imperial Roman times is a marked fact of history, and is to be traced in every department of history and life, and even in art (as Strzygowski especially has recently emphasized). The case of Iconium is merely one special example of the general principle.

The non-Phrygian part of the population must have been deeply affected by the local religion, as the analogy of every Hellenistic or Hellenic city shows. The Greeks themselves did not regard the Phrygian Cybele as wholly alien. Even in Greece proper she was received into the

¹ In *EXPOSITOR*, October, p. 286, l. 13, for "200" read "500."

Hellenic Pantheon, and her worship was sanctioned and protected in Athens and other cities by the State. In her own land she appealed with far stronger authority to the Greek mind. To the pagan mind the power of a deity was limited narrowly to his or her special country; but in her own country Cybele was supreme, and must be worshipped by all. It was not necessary for the settlers to abandon their own original gods; they merely added Cybele to the range of their worship. As they were in Cybele's own land, she quickly became the object of their deepest reverence in time of fear or anxiety, just as the settlers in Samaria turned to worship Jehovah as the local God when they suffered from lions in their new home (2 Kings xvii. 25 ff.).

On that groundwork of Cybele-worship there was superinduced a showy edifice of Greek public festivals and parade of municipal religion. The Greek mind always tended to emphasize in outward show the political side of religion; it tended to regard the Greek gods as the patrons of Greek institutions and society, free, graceful, joyous, young, self-assertive and capricious. Thus it was always tending in its outward life to disregard and ignore the deeper and more awe-inspiring side of religion; though it was, of course, always brought up sharply by the stern facts of existence, and then it found that those joyous Olympian gods, whom it had stripped of their awe and their terrors, were no longer able to help it in the hour of fear and danger and death. Then it always turned to the deeper and more efficacious religions and gods of the East, Asia Minor or Syria or Egypt.

On account of the close relation in which religion stood to the municipal institutions in a Greek city and to the patriotic chivalry of the citizens, every municipal fact had its religious counterpart or accompaniment. In a Hellenic city all these rites of political religion were of Greek char-

acter, and connected with the worship of Greek deities, such as Athena and Zeus. These therefore are the divinities who appear on the coins and give names to the Tribes of Iconium, and there were doubtless public festivals and games in their honour. This Hellenized cult was a real force in the city, for it was intertwined with all the constitutional facts and liberties, with all the educational and artistic developments in the city. Cybele did nothing and could do nothing for that side of Iconian history: she was oriental, and that was all western. But when the inscriptions afford evidence of deeper religious feeling, the Phrygian goddess is the object of it. No deity is actually mentioned in any inscription except the Zizimene goddess and the Emperors.

Accordingly, to describe the constitution and the liberties of Iconium is to describe the Greek side of its religious observances and festivals. Patriotism and municipal pride were summed up in its Greek rites. But to describe Iconian religion in the deeper sense of the term is to describe the worship of Cybele, in her local character as manifested at Zizima.

Extremely little information is given in the inscriptions about the cult of the Zizimene goddess. The accompaniments that go along with her image are the typical symbols of the Phrygian Cybele, the lions and the musical instruments.¹ These imply the wild dances which were performed to their sound. At Zizima events were dated according to the priest who was in office; and this custom seems to point back to the time when the priest was a dynast, and lord of all the land of the goddess and of all her servants, who dwelt on her land.²

¹ The tympanum is the only instrument which I have seen on any Zizimene monuments; but along with it in the Phrygian ritual always went flutes and cymbals.

² The evidence is an unpublished inscription copied by me in 1905 at Zizima. The single case proves the familiar ordinary usage.

The ritual, which was prescribed for those who were initiated into the Mysteries of Attis and Cybele, contained many analogies to the Jewish law and rites.¹ Fasts were enjoined. Certain foods were proscribed: e.g., the eating of fish, of the roots of vegetables, of pomegranates, and of apples, was forbidden to the Mystai. These foods were not forbidden as unclean, but because a mystic and sacred character, known only to the initiated, belonged to them. Even the ordinary worshippers were forbidden to eat garlic; and this prohibition approximates more to the nature of abstinence from unclean food. There were, undoubtedly, various other prohibitions and rules of purity, applying to all worshippers of the goddess, which were similar to the rules prescribed in the worship of Men Tyrannos or of Apollo Lairbenos²; but the whole subject is very imperfectly known, owing to the scantiness and accidental character of the records. It is, however, quite clear that there were grades in the religion. Much more thorough abstinence and fasts were required from those who advanced to the higher grade of Mystai than from the ordinary worshippers. Thus the Galatians who read the Epistle iii. 3, with its distinctions between beginners and those who go on to be perfected in Christian practice, naturally understood that there was here a reference to a lower and a higher grade: they had in fact been acting on the belief that there was such a distinction in their new religion, and that those who had begun with the simpler stage of Paulinism and spiritual religion were able to proceed to the harder stage of troublesome and painful service required by Judaic law.

Only one important feature of the Zizimene cult is revealed

¹ I take the facts of the Phrygian ritual from Daremberg and Sagliso, *Diet. des Antiq.*, arts. *Cybele* and *Gallus*.

² See Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, v. p. 116, *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, i. p. 136.

³ *Histor. Comm. on Gal.*, § xxvii. p. 324 f.

in the inscriptions. One of the priests, doubtless the chief priest, was styled "Archigallos," the chief of the Galli, the mutilated priests of Cybele and Attis. The name of Attis is not recorded in any of the inscriptions; but a dedication to Angdistis occurs, and the occurrence of this ugly and purely Phrygian deity proves that a figure corresponding to Attis played a part in the ritual, though possibly a different local name was used in place of Attis. The Anatolian priests bore commonly the name of their god, and the god is therefore likely to have been called Gallus at Zizima. Julian says that the god Attis bore also the name Gallus, and the chief priest of the cult at Pessinus (where was the chief home of the Attis legend) always assumed the name or title Attis. Moreover, a Roman inscription applies both titles, archigallus and Attis, to a Roman chief priest of the cult, implying that they were terms of slight difference which between them summed up the priest's authority and circle of duties.¹

It is an interesting fact, and probably not a mere accidental coincidence, that the existence of the title archigallus in the cult of Cybele during the Roman period is attested only at two places in Asia Minor, viz., in the Zizimene worship near Iconium and in the ritual of Men near Pisidian Antioch. The existence of such a chief priest implies that there was a body of priests bearing the name Galli at those two seats of the Cybele ritual. Those priests were the living attestation of the worst characteristics of that religion.²

The priests called Galli were bound to a certain ritual and to certain rules of life, which did not apply to the ordinary worshippers, or applied to them only during their occasional periods of divine service. Certain foods were

¹ C.I.L. vi. 2183, C. Camerius Crescens was "archigallus Matris deum et Attis populi Romani."

² The title is otherwise known epigraphically only at Rome. Strabo, p. 630, speaks of *οἱ ἀπόκοποι Γάλλοι* at Hierapolis in Phrygia.

forbidden to them, notably bread and pork.¹ They had certain dances, in imitation of the motion of the planets in the heavens, which were executed to the music of flutes, cymbals and tambourines. In the excitement of the dance the Galli were often stimulated to frenzy, clapping their hands, moving their heads violently, brandishing swords, daggers and axes, biting their flesh, or cutting themselves with their weapons till the blood flowed freely. They lashed themselves with cruel whips, whose lashes were strung with knuckle-bones. They had a certain series of sacred days in the year, on which they ran through the streets, uttering prophecies, teaching how sins might be expiated, and collecting donations in money, food and clothes. They had a special dress, calculated to give them a feminine appearance, they let their hair grow long and wore a head-dress called mitra (usually worn by women); they painted their faces; they wore translucent thin upper garments of yellow silk or linen, and sometimes also white tunics, with red stripes, girt round the waist; yellow shoes completed their attire. This was all "quite in the spirit of a religion of which it was characteristic to raise itself above the distinction of sex," and in which the androgynous being Angdistis was a leading figure.*

The resemblance of these practices of the Galli to the ritual of the modern Dervishes is striking. The turning Dervishes use the same musical instruments, and perhaps the same musical measures (for there is a world-wide difference in character and style between the ordinary

¹ The prohibition of bread was a survival from the primitive period when bread was unknown. A similar archaic survival was the rule that the self-mutilation described in the sequel must be performed with a sharp stone or flint (just as all repairs executed on the old wooden bridge at Rome must be made without using iron, because the construction was earlier than the age of iron in the Tiber valley).

² The words are quoted from my paper on the "Historical Relations between Phrygia and Cappadocia," p. 15 (*Journal of the Asiatic Society*, 1883).

Turkish music and that of the dervishes). Their dance, in the one place, where I have seen it properly performed, was obviously a representation of motion, in varying times and courses, of individuals round a central point. They wear a special attire of brilliantly coloured garments, not however all yellow, but of varying bright hues, saffron, violet, blue, white, crimson, olive, red and perhaps more. Other orders of Dervishes cut or wound themselves in frenzied excitement, though the worst mutilation practised by the Galli is prohibited along with some other excesses, since Mohammedanism, like Hellenism, has moderated the Phrygian excesses.

Most of the references to those priests and their rites, which are found in Greek and Roman literature, express contempt or abhorrence. The religion was denounced and despised as superstition by the saner thought of both Greeks and Romans. Where it was admitted by government, as in Athens and in Rome, formal laws were passed to regulate the ritual and tone down its excesses. In Rome the magistrates celebrated games and offered sacrifices in honour of the goddess whom the State had welcomed into its midst; but these rites were Roman in style, and the priesthood and the whole Phrygian ritual were entrusted to native Phrygians. Romans were forbidden to hold a priesthood, to wear the sacred dress, or to engage in the orgiastic rites of Cybele.² The hymns sung in Rome were expressed in Greek, not in Latin.

Yet this despised and barbarous ritual spread and deeply affected many individuals, especially among the

¹ This was in Afion-Kara-Hissar: in Konia (the chief centre of the dancing Dervishes), and in Constantinople the dance has preserved its old character more imperfectly: see Mrs. Ramsay's description, *Everyday Life in Turkey*, p. 271 ff.

² This prohibition was relaxed during the imperial time. An example of a Roman archigallus et Attis of the Roman people has been quoted above.

uneducated classes, in Greek and Roman cities. Its savage and frenzied devotion appalled and yet attracted the vulgar mind.

In Iconium we must consider that the worship of the Zizimene goddess took two forms, one the restrained and regulated worship of Athena Zizimena, the other the untamed and orgiastic native Phrygian worship. A sharp line divided the two rituals and their adherents: it was the line between education and ignorance, between Hellenism and barbarism, between orderliness and frenzy, between those who possessed perception (*νόησις*) and those who were insensate and stupid (*ἀνόητοι*), between the truly self-respecting, sober citizens of a constitutional Graeco-Roman State and the dull Orientals.

Ancient authorities are agreed that the most terrible and the most characteristic feature of Cybele-worship, the feature which especially stamped it as opposed to Hellenism, was the practice of self-mutilation as an act in the solemn ritual of the goddess; and this feature of the Phrygian religion is not without its bearing on the interpretation of a passage in St. Paul's letter to the Iconian and neighbouring churches (Gal. v. 12). After six years more of study, I have found myself gradually forced to a different opinion from that which is advocated in my *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, pp. 437-440, with regard to the meaning of that passage. The reason that weighs with me is the general principle which approves itself more and more as the safest to follow in reading the Epistles. The question to ask in a difficult passage is—how would the readers for whom the passage was intended necessarily understand these words? St. Paul cannot have left that out of consideration when he dictated his letter; and thus part at least of the meaning, and that an essential part, can be determined with practical certainty. Now considering the importance

attached to the practice of self-mutilation in the service of the Goddess, it cannot be doubted that Iconian and Antiochian readers would naturally understand the words of Galatians v. 12 to refer to self-mutilation. The existence of the priesthood of the Galli is a conclusive proof that this terrible practice, so abhorrent to Greek feeling, was not unknown in the religion of the city. There is, indeed, no reason to think that this horror was an ordinary part of the ritual or even a frequent though extraordinary accompaniment. It was an act of extravagant sacrifice, occurring in times of great danger and public excitement; but it was fixed in the memory of men and was consciously present to them as a fact of the Phrygian religion. However much the excesses to which the religion was prone might be restrained by the ruling Hellenic order of the city, its spirit could hardly have been so subdued there as it had been in Athens during the period when the energy of that city was at its highest, about the beginning of the Peloponnesian war,¹ yet in Athens on the altar of the Twelve Gods this supreme act of self-sacrifice was performed after the order of the Cybele-ritual by a devotee about 415 B.C.

In Iconium, therefore, even in the milder age of the early Empire, there must have still survived the thought of the possibility that this action might be committed in the frenzy of Cybele's rites; and the allusion in Galatians v. 12 must have been caught by Iconian readers. I should now be disposed to go even further, and say that St. Paul must have had this thought in his mind when he wrote the words. One who had such a marvellous power of comprehending his audience must have known how his

¹ The official worship of Cybele at a public State temple was permitted in 430 B.C., the second year of the war, in expiation of the execution of a strolling priest of Cybele, who had been thrown into the Burathrum because he initiated Athenian women into those barbarian rites.

readers would understand the words. It is certainly a noteworthy fact that the only places in Asia Minor where the priests called Galli are known to have survived so late as the second century after Christ are the two principal Churches of South Galatia, Antioch of Pisidia and Iconium.

The meaning of Galatians v. 12 seems therefore no longer open to doubt. This is one of those passages which one can only regret that St. Paul ever wrote. One must feel and say that it is utterly unjustifiable and inexcusable to bring the thought of this detestable act of pagan frenzy into connexion with his Jewish-Christian opponents. At several other points in his life one cannot but feel that he was harsh and even unfair to the Jewish-Christians and to the Jews; but there is no other place where he comes so near the tone of later theological controversy, when the first rule of method seems almost to have been to attack the moral character of opponents. He does not indeed say that his adversaries would perform the act, but to express the wish that they should do what was regarded with such horror and loathing by the more educated classes of society was an insult of dark character. The wrong was not wholly on the side of the Jews in their quarrel with Paul; and a saying like this shows that their hatred to him was not unprovoked.

But, while acknowledging that the bitter sarcasm was unfair and inexcusable, one must try to understand how Paul was betrayed into it. In reading the Epistle to the Galatians one sees that two views, which bear on this topic, are emphasized in the letter. One is that *Noësis*, the intellectual insight, the free and generous perception of truth, which springs from education, was on the side of the Pauline Christian; and that it was a proof of defective education and of slavish spirit to sink into Judaistic ritual, to observe days and weeks and seasons and years.

The Judaizing Galatians were devoid of Noësis (ἀνότητες, iii. 1).¹ The second is really another aspect of the first: the Jews were on the same stage, in a certain way, as the barbarous Phrygians, because they were enslaved under "the weak and beggarly rudiments," the elementary principles of ritual (iv. 3, 8-11).² This latter view is one of the most remarkable features of the Letter to the Galatians, and it must have seemed to the Jews an outrage and a sin against national feeling. Yet in several passages of the Letter, indubitably, the writer has in his mind the idea that Jewish ritual stands to Christian spirituality in the same relation as Phrygian ritual to educated Noësis.

It was through the eager desire to emphasize and drive home this thought, that Paul let himself be led on to the utterance of v. 12: "Since they misuse their opportunities and their influence to disturb you and unsettle your religious views, I wish they would go on to the fullest and last extreme to which ritualistic practices can be carried, and thus display to the world what the real character of their error is."

Another side of the old Phrygian religion, which might be treated at great length, because it is the best known, is too unpleasant to merit more than a brief allusion. The standard of moral conduct encouraged and even prescribed as a religious duty was so low as to offend the Greek taste, which was itself very far from delicate in such matters. The Greek feeling of earlier times had regarded the mere profession by citizens, or the propagation among citizens of the Phrygian ritual as a danger to morality which must be stopped by the sternest measures; and, though the Athenian government in 430 B.C. regretted and atoned for its previous strict and wise action, yet the best opinion among Greek thinkers still continued hostile. The Chris-

Histor. Comm. on Galatians, §§ xxvi. and xxvii. p. 321 f.

² *Histor. Comm.*, § xlii. p. 331.

tian writers, who defended their own faith by attacking the vices and immorality taught in the pagan cults, found their best field of operations in the Phrygian Mysteries, and it is in this way that much of the information we possess on the subject has been transmitted. Their picture is in one sense not a true one, for it is incomplete and one-sided, giving professedly only the evil; but it is true in the sense that it invents nothing and describes real facts of the ritual; certain of the details are corroborated by pagan authorities, and the low character of the ritual as a whole was stigmatized quite as strongly by Greeks as by Christians.

It seems needless, here, to do more than point out that the inevitable result was to give to a Christian teacher like St. Paul, when he first began to speak in a Hellenized land, the appearance of being a philosophic teacher, who like many predecessors, was full of contempt and abhorrence for the debased superstitions of the native and non-Hellenic religion. This was the first impression that would spread in such a city as Iconium or Pisidian Antioch, as afterwards in Athens: here was a new popular lecturer on moral philosophy, who discussed the theory of life with other philosophers before the public. Inevitably, it soon became apparent in all those cities that this first impression was wrong. The philosophers were almost as hateful to Paul as the superstitious barbarian; and the reason was that they were all equally indulgent to idolatry. The philosopher, who had no real belief in any god, was perfectly ready to acquiesce in the barbarous ritual, or, at the best, to look for an element of thought in it, and shut his eyes to its abuses. If Paul's "spirit was provoked within him, as he beheld the city of Athens full of idols," it was not because idolatry was more rampant or worse in character there than elsewhere, but because in this centre of the world's education, where philosophy was

supreme, and where the best and most respected teachers were gathered—in that city which stood forth as most thoroughly governed by reason and thought—idolatry was just as completely dominant in religion as it had been among the half-Hellenized or un-Hellenized rabble in Lystra.

VII. CHRISTIANITY IN LYCAONIA AND ICONIUM.

The variation in the meaning and extension of the term Lycaonia at different periods is apt to be the cause of much difficulty. It has been pointed out that Iconium was not a Lycaonian city under the Roman Empire: it was a city of the Phrygian district of the Province Galatia from 25 B.C. to about 295 A.D., and the Province or district Lycaonia was distinct from it. From 295 to 372 it was a city, the second in rank, of the Province Pisidia. Only about 372 did it become a city of the Province Lycaonia, which had ceased to have any political existence between 295 and 372. But geographically Iconium is Lycaonian, the natural metropolis of the great Lycaonian plains; and under the Republic the Romans had treated it as such.

It will be convenient, while discussing Christian Lycaonia, to follow the mature organization of the Church, and to use the name Lycaonia in the Byzantine sense (later than 372 A.D.) as the Province whose metropolis was Iconium, and which extended from Seidi-Sheher Lake on the south-west to near the north end of Lake Tatta on the north-east, and to Laranda on the extreme south and south-east. This final organization was the recognition of a certain solidarity of the district (though the inclusion of Misthia, Vasada and Amblada on the south-east seems rather like a theft from Pisidia, and is not explicable with our present knowledge except as an arbitrary extension of Lycaonia).¹

¹ There may, of course, be some real ground for the inclusion, as yet unknown.

The spread of Christianity through Lycaonia is not merely an interesting subject in itself, but also throws some light back on the foundation of the Church in Lycaonia. Lycaonia is the only Province of the Empire whose Church was practically complete and fully developed as early as the fourth century. In the two great councils of the fourth century, held at Nicaea in 325 and at Constantinople in 381, Lycaonia was almost fully represented (taking the two together) in spite of the long land-journey which its bishops had to make. The only apparent absentee was the bishop of Verinopolis. But Verinopolis was not a city in that century; it was merely a village of the territory of Laodiceia until A. D. 474, and it could have no bishop until it was raised to the rank of a city. There were also several village bishops from Lycaonia present at Nicaea; but their villages are not named.

This great body of seventeen Lycaonian Churches, fully organized and probably forming a compact body in opinion as well as in geographical relation, must have been a strong force in the third and fourth centuries. With it was closely associated the neighbouring body of Pisidian bishops, of whom eighteen were present at one or other of the fourth century Councils, while six did not appear until the fifth or the seventh century.¹ The latter are mostly towns of the mountain-region of Taurus or at least remote from the great roads; the former are for the most part situated directly on the great lines of communication, and connected closely with Antioch and the original Pauline Churches; but there are some marked exceptions.² Still, the less mountainous part of Pisidia, a large territory, approximates to the completeness of ecclesiastical organization that appears in Lycaonia. Both attest the strong

¹ The Pisidian bishoprics are described minutely in an article on *Pisidia and the Lycaonian Frontier* (*Annual of the British School at Athens* 1902-3, pp. 243 ff.).

² These exceptions cannot be discussed here.

and lasting effect produced by St. Paul's original work.

No province of the Empire was so strongly represented at those Councils in proportion to its number of bishoprics in its most fully developed period as Lycaonia. A glance at the lists will prove that; but here it is not possible to quote more than one example. Contrast with this great body of thirty-five Lycaonian and Pisidian bishops, active at the Councils of the fourth century, the condition of Galatia during the same period. In Galatia eleven bishoprics cannot be traced before the fifth century; only seven Galatian bishops were present at the Councils of the fourth century, and of those seven one was originally Asian and two belonged to cities that lay so far south as to come under the influence of Iconium (as we shall see).¹ Yet it was much easier for those Galatian bishops to be present at Nicaea or Constantinople than it was for the Lycaonian bishops.² Galatia was so extensive that it was divided into two Provinces about 395 A.D.

Moreover Lycaonia was not yet a Province in 325: its bishops were divided between the Provinces of Galatia, Pisidia, and Isauria. Yet this broken and disunited region sent nine bishops to Nicaea, while the large and wealthy and populous Provinces of Asia and Lydia sent only eight each; and the two Provinces of Phrygia, teeming before with cities and afterwards with bishoprics, sent only eight between them. The fact that Phrygia sent so few bishops to the Councils of the fourth century, however, has probably a peculiar and pathetic explanation. It has been pointed out elsewhere³ that Phrygia seems to

¹ Troknades, Asian until 295 A.D. Cinna, close to Lycaonia, and Gdamava, actually Lycaonian from 372 onwards, though reckoned to Galatia in 325.

² The Galatian, absentees (with one exception) belonged to the western cities, nearest to Nicaea or Constantinople: Ancyra, with the eastern cities generally, sent bishops to the fourth century Councils.

³ *Contemporary Review*, Sept. 1896, p. 435; *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, ch. xii.

have suffered more than any other country during the last great persecution under Diocletian, only a few years before the Council of Nicaea. It was swept literally with fire and sword. Massacre carried to such a systematic and ruthless extreme had almost destroyed the organization of the Church in Phrygia. It is possible to exterminate a religion, as Christianity was exterminated in Japan in the sixteenth century; and the result in Phrygia was almost a complete destruction of the education and the intellectual element in the country¹; the later Phrygian Christianity was mainly of a different type from the older, illiterate and standing apart from the development of the eastern Church.

From this preponderance in the fourth century it may be inferred with confidence that,—

1. Lycaonia was very thoroughly Christianized; there had practically ceased to be a religious question of the older kind, owing to the almost total disappearance of the pagan; and the country was free to devote its attention to the consolidation of the Church as a whole:

2. Lycaonia was heartily on the "Orthodox" side (to use a bad but convenient term), and in favour of making the general consensus of the Church the supreme rule binding upon all.

The favourable situation of the Lycaonian Church in the fourth century can only be explained as the result of a long and steady development during the first three. Practically the sole evidence bearing on this process is in the distribution of early Christian inscriptions. These are very numerous, but they have not yet been properly collected and classified. I have personally copied most of them (about half of them during the last five years), and most of the others are due to my friend and old pupil, Mr. J. G. C. Anderson, who was in constant communication with me while he was travelling; hence I can speak from a

¹ *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, ii. loc. cit.

general outlook over the whole series. There still remain many villages to examine, but I do not think that further discovery will alter any of the positive inferences which follow from the facts as already collected, though it will probably add materially to them by revealing new features.

The known inscriptions show definitely that the spread of Christianity was connected with the main lines of communication, viz. (1) the two great roads across the Empire from east to west, one the central route in its two courses, the trade route through Laodiceia to Cappadocia and to the Cilician Gates by Savatra; the other through Pisi-dian Antioch, Iconium, and Derbe to the Cilician Gates.¹ (2) The main road for the administration of the Province Galatia, viz. the way from Iconium to Ancyra. It is obvious that these sum up the important Roman lines across Lycaonia. Along them the main tides of inter-course swept back and forwards, and Christianity spread most quickly where thought and activity were quickest.

The right way to bring out the evidence on this point would be to mark by a dot (say red) on the map the locality of every Christian inscription that has been found, and by a dot of different colour (e.g. black) the locality of every non-Christian inscription. Then the predominance of red over black would indicate plainly the lines of Christian influence, while the preponderance of black over red (especially where the former indicated inscriptions as late as the third century) would mark a district in which Christianity was late in spreading. On the other hand no negative inferences can at present be drawn; i.e. where Christian inscriptions and pagan both fail, it is not safe forthwith to infer that Christianity was late in spreading there. The want may be due to insufficient exploration, or to other causes. It is only marked preponder-

¹ On these roads see especially Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, v. p. 388, and map at p. 400. The road through Savatra is there called the Syrian Route.

ance of the red or the black that justifies inference as yet.

The red dots would be found in clusters at point after point along the road from Iconium to Ancyra, at Verinopolis a few, a good many at Suwerek and at Kara-Bagh (close to the site of an ancient town), a large number still further north at the site of Drya (united in the same bishopric with Egdamava or Glavama) in the extreme north-east of Lycaonia, and at Kinna close on the Galatian side of the frontier. There they cease almost entirely. A large group of red dots would be found also about seven or eight miles W.N.W. from Kara-Bagh, but there they stop; and several groups of black dots, with one or two red among them, would be found here and there in the great plains on the frontier of Galatia and Asia, marking that region as very late in being touched by Christianity.

Similarly, groups of red dots would mark the line of the trade route, and the country within a few miles south or north of it from a point not far east of Tyriaion through Laodiceia to Suwerek. Further east, towards Cappadocia, there is an epigraphic blank. On the Syrian route from Suwerek as far as Savatra the red dots abound; but beyond there is another blank with three dots at Kanna, and one at Hyde, and one at Cybistra.

Not merely are the early Christian inscriptions almost confined to the roads, they are also far more numerous in the region of Iconian influence. This points to another way in which Christianity spread, viz., not through travelling and regular missionary enterprise, but through steady uniform influence within the reach of a settled permanent body or congregation. Practically this meant that the new faith spread from village to village over Iconian territory and Lycaonia generally. Nothing is more remarkable in a historical view than the Christian inscriptions of the Lycaonian villages. These are in themselves most insignificant, and apparently valueless. They are easily missed

by the traveller, being so slight, so badly incised by untrained hands (only scratched, as a rule), and so liable to obliteration, for the stones were not often prepared, and the inscription easily disappears. But they are, so far as my experience goes, almost always Christian, and they show that (with the exception of important villages on the great roads, like Psebila or Salarama, § IV.) the Lycaonian villagers awoke to education only in a Christian form. But everything points to the conclusion that this awakening of the villages took place, in part at least of Lycaonia, earlier than in any other region of Asia Minor.

This is a subject where it is not safe to speak without further exploration of a very minute kind by a careful epigraphist, and a collection and classification of the existing material (which is now being prepared by my friend and old pupil, Professor A. Souter, of Mansfield College). I must here plead for further exploration at once in the central plains. Important work still awaits the explorer in Lycaonia, and it will not wait long. The materials for Christian history are abundant, and everywhere they are perishing rapidly. The transformation and rebuilding, which affected the lands nearer the west coast a generation or more ago, seems to have just begun on the central plains; and in the process the old stones on the surface will be used up, others may be afterwards disclosed; but the first crop, now visible, ought to be secured, before it is buried in the walls of the new houses, hiding in this way the solution of many problems of Christian history.

In 1905 we came on several villages which were actually in the process of building, as Yuruks, Kurds, or other nomads are settling down to the life of agriculture. We heard of inscribed stones that had been put into the new buildings; and we copied some while they were in the masons' hands about to be built up in the walls. This process will be completed in a year or two; and then it will be too late to do anything.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF ST. PAUL.

(10) ANGER AND THE SELF-ASSERTIVE VIRTUES.

ATTENTION has been called in a previous paper to the prominence given by St. Paul to the passive virtues. But these, important as they are, do not constitute the whole duty of man in the presence of wrong-doing. To resent and resist may be, as the Apostle himself clearly saw and said, as sacred a duty as to submit. In order, therefore, to maintain that "delicate equipoise" in which all morality has been said to consist, we must balance the passive virtues with what, in the absence of a better term, may be named the self-assertive virtues.

When, however, adopting the method pursued in previous papers, we turn to St. Paul's Epistles in order to collect and collate the various passages relating to our subject, we are somewhat embarrassed to discover how extremely few they are. The poverty of material is the more striking when we compare it with the numerous precepts and varied vocabulary which our study of the passive virtues revealed and brought together. St. Paul does, indeed, make it plain that a man ought to feel and show resentment towards evil doing; but the few occasions on which he says this are far outnumbered by his warnings against all excess and abuse of the passion. This seeming lack of emphasis does not, however, argue any disregard in the Apostle's mind of an important group of virtues, nor does it expose Christian morality to the charge of one-sidedness. As John Stuart Mill has truly observed (without, however, appearing to realize the full significance of his own remark), "the Gospel always refers to a pre-existing morality, and confines its precepts to the particulars in which that morality was to be corrected, or superseded by a wider and higher."¹ When, therefore, we find the early Christian teachers so

eloquent concerning meekness and forbearance, so silent concerning resentment, we have only to remember what Pagan morality was, alike in its theory and practice, in order to understand both their silence and their speech. Moreover, in the case of St. Paul self-knowledge would still further reinforce the natural tendency to exalt the virtues of self-restraint. Every record of the Apostle we possess reveals to us a man of ardent, choleric temperament. A spark was sufficient to kindle his whole being and wrap it in devouring flame. Was it not natural, therefore, that such a man, knowing the perils of his own fiery soul, should speak to men rather of meekness than of wrath, and should urge both upon himself and them the need of banking up and keeping low their inward fires? At no period of the world's history, and least of all perhaps in the days when St. Paul lived and taught, has mankind been by nature "slow to wrath"; rather has it always been, as it still is, quick to resent and loth to forgive. And in the Apostle's teaching, alike in what is said and in what is left unsaid, we may trace the faithful reflection of this twofold fact.

Scanty, however, as our material is, it is not inadequate for our present purpose; and if to the Epistles we join the narrative of the Acts, and so keep in mind what the Apostle did as well as what he said, example and precept together will not fail to suggest a true *via media* between a too tame subservience on the one hand, and an undue self-assertion on the other. We proceed, therefore, to a brief consideration of the relevant scriptures.

I.

The most cursory reading of the Acts of the Apostles will be sufficient to dispel any misapprehension into which we may have been led by St. Paul's teaching concerning the passive virtues. There is, indeed, no inconsistency between

the hero of St. Luke's narrative and the author of the Pauline Epistles ; the man who could speak as St. Paul did to the elders of Ephesus by the seashore at Miletus surely had it in him to write the thirteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians or the twelfth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. But what impresses us in St. Luke's portraiture, even more than the tact, the sympathy, the tenderness, of the Apostle, is his firmness, his self-reliance, his boldness in rebuke, his readiness to insist upon himself, and to demand that justice shall be done—the very virtues, in short, which the term “passive” does *not* describe. Note, e.g., the haughty language with which he brings the bustling “Praetors” of Philippi to a sense of their duty, and asserts his right as a Roman citizen: “They have beaten us publicly, uncondemned, men that are Romans, and have cast us into prison; and do they now cast us out privily? nay, verily; but let them come themselves and bring us out.”¹ Or take that tremendous scene in the island of Paphos which St. Luke has etched for us, memorable as a group of Greek statuary: the Apostle with blazing eyes and speech like molten lava—“O full of all guile and all villany, thou son of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?”—the cowering magician, dumb and blind beneath the lightning of that terrible wrath, and in the background the astonished proconsul.² Again, in the high priest's council chamber in Jerusalem Ananias saw the forked flicker of that angry tongue of fire. The Apostle had just begun his defence when Ananias bade them that stood by to smite him on the mouth: “Then said Paul unto him, God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: and sittest thou to judge me according to the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?”³

¹ Acts xvi. 37; cp. also xxii. 25-8.² Acts xiii. 8-12.³ Acts xxiii. 1-3.

Sometimes as pliant and yielding as a willow, at other times St. Paul would be as unbending as a bar of steel. Once he "thought it not good" to do a certain thing, neither Barnabas nor any other man could move him from his purpose, and he was ready to part with a friend and brother apostle rather than yield.¹

Such is the man whom St. Luke's narrative reveals to us. The same ardent temperament shines and glows in the Epistles. There is the same impatience of weakness, the same restlessness under injustice, the same hot indignation against evildoers. "Who," cries the Apostle, "is made to stumble and I am not on fire?"² With the Judaizers, the men who sought to make of none effect the Cross of Christ, he would make peace on no terms; he crushed them without pity and without remorse whenever they crossed his path. They were "dogs,"³ anathema from Christ.⁴ "Why," he asks with scornful irony, "if they make so much of circumcision, do they stop there? Why do they not mutilate themselves like the priests of Cybele?"⁵ Nor was it only against these nameless Judaizers that the Apostle drew the sword of his rebuke; if St. Peter's primacy cannot ensure his walking "uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel," neither can it shield him from righteous condemnation. "When," says St. Paul, "Cephas came to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he stood condemned."⁶ Even the last letter which we have from his pen, tender and subdued as it is, shows us the old fires still burning: "Alexander the

¹ Acts xv. 37-9.

² 2 Cor. xi. 29.

³ Phil. iii. 2.

⁴ Gal. i. 8, 9.

⁵ Gal. iv. 12. (See Lightfoot *in loc.*) "There is," says Mr. R. H. Hutton, "something positively grim in the Eastern ferocity of the wish expressed in the Epistle to the Galatians (v. 12) against the false brethren who troubled the Church by insisting on the strict Jewish circumcision."—*Theological Essays*, p. 331.

⁶ Gal. ii. 11.

coppersmith did me much evil : the Lord will render to him according to his works.”¹

When we pass from St. Paul’s example to his precepts there is little to add, though one or two sayings look in the same direction. When he bids the Ephesians, “ Be angry and sin not,”² and when he says that a bishop must be “ not soon angry ” (*ὀργιλος*),³ he evidently assumes that anger is not in itself a sin. Are we not, moreover, justified in inferring that St. Paul’s ideal of human nature must include something akin to that sternly real element in the Divine nature which he names “ the wrath of God ” ?

II.

It would be easy to show, did it lie within the scope of this paper to do so, that the conception of duty suggested by the foregoing paragraphs is in complete harmony with the general spirit of Scripture teaching in Old Testament and New Testament alike. To holy men of old their God was “ a God that hath indignation every day ”⁴ ; and the passion which they knew to be in Him was meant they believed to have its counterpart in them. The Hebrew prophets, it has been truly said, did not discuss the sins of the Hebrew people with philosophical serenity, nor condemn them with judicial calmness ; some of their discourses are tempestuous with passion.”⁵ And does not the New Testament speak of “ the wrath of the Lamb ? ” Is it not written of the meek and lowly Jesus that He was “ moved with indignation,”⁶ that he looked round “ with anger,”⁷ that He “ entered into the temple of God and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold the doves ” ?⁸ And did ever the wrath of man

¹ 2. Tim. iv. 14.

² Eph. iv. 26.

³ Titus i. 7.

⁴ Psalm vii. 11, R.V.

⁵ R. W. Dale’s *Week-Day Sermons*, p. 99.

⁶ Mark x. 13.

⁷ Mark iii. 5.

⁸ Matt. xxi. 12.

clothe itself in more heart-shaking words than those with which He laid bare the shame of men who sat in Moses' seat and boasted that they had Abraham to their father, while yet their evil deeds proclaimed them the children of the devil whose lusts it was their will to do?¹

It is plain, therefore, that according to Christian morality the whole duty of a good man in the presence of evil does not consist in turning his cheek to the smiter and in suffering whatsoever evil is pleased and able to inflict. Rather ought the first impulse roused by the sight of vice to be, as the author of *Ecce Homo* says, the impulse of opposition and hostility. "To convict it, to detect it, to contend with it, to put it down, is the first and indispensable thing . . . It is not mercy but treason against injustice to relent towards vice so long as it is triumphant and insolent."² Nor has such a feeling anything in common with malice or the spirit of revenge; it is resentment against vice and wickedness, which is one of the bonds by which society is held together, a sharp sword put into our hands for our defence against injury, injustice, and cruelty.³

¹ Matt. xxiii. Many of my readers will be glad to be reminded of the following striking passage from one of F. W. Robertson's letters: "Mr. E—— remarked in conversation, that our Lord never once used irony. I alleged Mark vii. 9: 'Full *well* ye reject,' etc., which after a long discussion, and the production of Greek Testaments, etc., was universally admitted to be decisive. Then came the maxim, that the indignation expressed by Him against hypocrisy was no precedent for us, inasmuch as He spake as a Divine person . . . I contended that it was human, and that if a man did not feel something of the same spirit under similar circumstances, if his blood would not boil with indignation, nor the syllable of withering justice rise to his lips, he could not even conceive His spirit. Mr. E—— agreed to this, to my surprise, and told an anecdote. 'Could you not have felt indignation for that, Robertson?' My blood was at the moment running fire—not at his story, however; and I remembered that I had once in my life stood before my fellow-creature with words that scathed and blasted; once in my life I felt a terrible might; I knew, I rejoiced to know, that I was inflicting the sentence of a coward's and a liar's hell." (*Life and Letters*, vol. i. p. 261.)

² Pop. ed. p. 245.

³ See Butler's great sermon on Resentment.

Woe to the man or nation that has lost the capacity for righteous anger! "Anger," says Thomas Fuller, "is one of the sinews of the soul; he that wants it hath a maimed mind."

"Man or race is on the downward path
Whose fibre grows too soft for honest wrath."

Mr. John Morley even goes so far as to say that active hatred of cruelty, injustice, and oppression is perhaps the main difference between a good man and a bad one."¹

This is one of the main points at which the ethical teaching of St. Paul is in direct conflict with the doctrine of Seneca and the Stoics with which it has so often been compared. The ideal of the Stoic was *ἀπάθεια*, passionlessness. Anger, in his eyes, was not a wild plant to be trained, but a poisonous weed to be uprooted. Nothing must be tolerated whose presence could disturb the serenity of the mind. "Seneca almost gets angry himself at the very notion of the wise man being angry and indignant even against moral evil."² The gods themselves, it was believed, dwell in some

"lucid interspace of world and world,
Where never creeps a cloud, or moves a wind,
Nor ever falls the least white star of snow,
Nor ever lowest roll of thunder moans,
Nor sound of human sorrow mounts to mar
Their sacred everlasting calm!"

¹ *Life of Gladstone*, vol. i. p. 193. I cannot deny myself the pleasure of yet another reference to Dean Church, of all modern Englishmen perhaps the most wholly Christian alike in mind and heart. Bishot Paget, his son-in-law, writes concerning him: "Patient as he was, he could be angry when need came; angry with a quiet and self-possessed intensity which made his anger very memorable. The sight of injustice, of strength or wealth presuming on its advantages, of insolence (a word that came from his lips with a peculiar ring and emphasis), called out in him something like the passion that has made men patriots when their people were oppressed, something of that temper which will always make tyranny insecure and persecution hazardous. One felt that many years of quiet and hidden self-control must lie behind the power of wielding rightly such a weapon as that anger; an anger that was just and strong and calm."

² F. W. Farrar's *Seekers after God*.

What higher thing, then, could man desire than to be like unto them? That this was not the ideal of St. Paul needs not to be said. It is doubtful if he could have understood it; if he could, it is certain he would have repudiated it.

Equally distant is St. Paul's ideal from the emasculate, sentimental thing which sometimes passes itself off as "good nature," but which is not good at all, but only bad because it is weak. The peril of the passive virtues, as has already been said, is that they are so readily counterfeited; yet a good man's forbearance has really as little in common with mere tolerance as his righteous resentment has with malice. The sight of evil ought to awaken indignation within us; we may for good reasons restrain and suppress it, but the feeling should be there; it is the soul's recoil, as natural and instinctive in the morally healthy as the shutting of the eyelids against a threatened blow. The lazy tolerance which is incapable of it is not "good nature," it is simply moral "mushiness." The author of *Ecce Homo* states the truth with even more than his usual lucidity and force: "Because," he says, "it has had a considerable effect in softening manners, because it has given a new prominence and dignity to the female sex, and because it has produced great examples of passive virtues, Christianity is sometimes represented as averse to strong passions, as making men excessively unwilling to inflict pain, as fostering a morbid, or at least a feminine, tenderness. . . . The Enthusiasm of Humanity does indeed destroy a great deal of hatred, but it creates as much more. Selfish hatred is indeed charmed away, but a not less fiery passion takes its place. Dull serpentine malice dies, but a new unselfish anger begins to live. The bitter feelings which so easily spring up against those who thwart us, those who compete with us, those who surpass us, are destroyed by the Enthusiasm of Humanity; but it creates a new bitterness, which displays itself on occasions where

before the mind had reposed in a benevolent calm. It creates an intolerant anger against all who do wrong to human beings, an impatience of selfish enjoyment, a vindictive enmity to tyrants and oppressors, a bitterness against sophistry, superstition, self-complacent heartless speculation, an irreconcilable hostility to every form of imposture, such as the uninspired, inhumane soul could never entertain.”¹

III.

Anger, then, must be accorded a place among those affections of our nature which it is our business not to crush but to chasten and to guide. We conclude our account of St. Paul’s teaching on the subject with a reference to his warning against all excess and abuse of the passion.

“Be ye angry, and sin not.”² Gladstone’s biographer says of him, that “in native capacity for righteous anger he abounded. The flame soon kindled, and it was no fire of straw; but it did not master him.”³ This is the Christian ideal. Anger is a good servant, but a bad master. As long as it is kept well in hand we may yoke it to many noble ends; in revolt against all authority there is scarcely any mischief of which it may not be the author. Anger is the fire of the soul, and just as a prudent housewife takes care that her kitchen fire neither dies out nor yet grows too fierce, so will the wise man keep watch over himself—at one time rekindling the dying embers, at another pushing in the damper when the flame roars and races in the chimney. Sinless in itself anger can assume shapes of direst wickedness. *Touchiness*, which a spark borne by any chance wind will cause to flare up like gunpowder, and *peerishness*, which, as Butler says, “languidly discharges itself upon everything which comes in its way,” and *hatred*, deadly and implacable, “dull, serpentine malice,” which

¹ Pop. ed. 26. 1. ² Eph. iv. 26. 7. ³ Mosley’s *Life*, vol. i. 139.

knows neither pity nor change, and *revenge*, clutching at its helpless victim's throat till the utmost farthing be paid—do we not know them all? And all these St. Paul bids us to put away, and to put on rather, “as God's elect, a heart of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, long-suffering.”¹

Not less noteworthy than his warnings against unrighteous wrath are the Apostle's words against provocation to anger. Fathers he urges not to provoke their children to wrath²; masters he enjoins, in their dealings with their servants, to “forbear threatening,”³ and all men he exhorts not to be “vain-glorious, provoking one another, envying one another.”⁴ This is one of the most practical aspects of a practical matter which does not receive the attention it deserves. It is the duty of every man to avoid giving needless provocation, and perhaps there are none who need more to lay that duty to heart than just those who are themselves endowed with a double portion of the grace of good temper. For it is a matter of common experience that good-natured people are of all men sometimes the most exasperating. Their good nature goes along with a certain slackness which to others of prompt and business-like habits is a source of continual vexation. The servant whose easy-going ways bring down upon him the sharp—perhaps too sharp—rebuke of a quick-tempered master who has disciplined himself by the habits of a lifetime to punctuality and thoroughness, ought not to content himself with lamenting his master's loss of temper; he should set about to cure the slackness which has provoked it. And in every way it should be the aim of all to “give no occasion of stumbling.” When we have discovered what is another's besetting sin we owe it to him to put no

¹ Col. iii. 12, 13.

² Eph. vi 4; Col. iii. 21.

³ Eph. vi. 9

⁴ Gal. v. 26.

temptation in his path, but, as far as in us lies, to take sides with him in seeking to overcome it. If it is the passionate man's duty to pour water upon the gunpowder of his nature, it is none the less ours to avoid scattering idle sparks in his presence.

GEORGE JACKSON.

STUDIES IN THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

VI.

CHRISTIAN HEART ASSURANCE.

Herein we shall know that we are of the truth,

And before Him [God] shall assure our hearts :

Because, if our heart condemn us—because God is greater than our heart and knows all !

Beloved, if our heart do not condemn us, we have confidence toward God,

And whatsoever we may ask we receive from Him ;

Because we keep His commands, and do the things pleasing in His sight.

And this is His command :

That we believe the name of His Son Jesus Christ,

And love one another as He gave us command.

And he that keeps His commands, dwells in Him—and He in him.

And herein we know that He dwells in us,—from the Spirit that He gave us.

—1 *John* iii. 19-24.

THIS section of the Epistle is separated from that which we examined in Paper V. (*vv.* 4-10 : on *The Inadmissibility of Sin*) by a digression on the contrasted cases of Cain and Jesus (*vv.* 11-18), the false and the true Son of Man, who supply the patterns of hate and of love respectively and represent the conflicting types of humanity, "the children of the Devil" and "the children of God" (*v.* 10). Sin, it had been shown, belonged to the world that is passing away, and took on in its prototype Cain, the two conspicuous features of unrighteousness and hate. This Satanic manifestation was confronted with its opposite in the self-devotion of Jesus, in whose sacrifice the readers are to find not only the means of their salvation from sin, but

the example of the sinless life they are pledged to pursue. The example of the Cross was copied on the great occasions of martyrdom occurring in Apostolic times, when a man was called upon "to lay down his life for the brethren" (v. 16), but it sustains no less the ordinary appeals to charity in matters of food and housing and the like (ὁ βίος τοῦ κόσμου τούτου), in which the necessities of fellow-Christians challenge the genuineness of our professed love to God and man and exercise our sympathetic care. By such tests it is shown whether our Christianity is matter of talk and sentiment, or of heart-reality (vv. 17, 18).

Having reached this point and set his readers on self-examination by the appeal, *τεκνία, μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν λόγῳ μὴδὲ τῇ γλώσσῃ, ἀλλὰ ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ*, the Apostle knows that misgivings will arise in the minds of some of them—a suspicion as to the truth and depth of their life in Christ, that is not altogether ungrounded. He goes on to probe the uneasy conscience, framing his words in verses 19–24 in a manner calculated at once to encourage the sincere and self-distrustful, whose heart could not accuse them of callousness, and to alarm the self-complacent, who allowed themselves, like the Laodiceans so sternly rebuked in the Apocalypse, to be wrapped up in their wealth of knowledge or of material goods. *The grounds of Christian assurance* form, therefore, the topic of this section, which brings the third chapter of the Epistle, and with it this Series of Studies, to a close. While stating the grounds of assurance in the first and last clauses of the passage (vv. 19, 24b), St. John points out to the Christian man *the bearing and effect on his relations to God of the absence or presence of heart-assurance*, the former being intimated in verse 20 and the latter dwelt upon in verses 21–24a.

I. It is St. John's manner to strike the keynote at the outset, and to resume it in some altered and enriched form at the conclusion of each passage. The "Herein" (ἐν

τούτῳ γνωσόμεθα, γινώσκομεν) of verse 24, accordingly, takes up the "Herein" of verse 19 (cf. the almost identical repetition in verses 3 and 5*b* of chap. ii.): here lies the double basis of the settled believer's confidence towards God, which is found (1) in *the consciousness of an unfeigned brotherly love* shown in generous self-forgetting acts—the former ἐν τούτῳ gathering up the sense of verses 16–18; and (2) in *the well-remembered and abiding gift of the Holy Spirit*—the latter ἐν τούτῳ being explained by the definition that follows, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος οὗ ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν. Our Apostle thus affirms the essential two-fold fact of the Christian consciousness, that inner conviction of the child of God concerning his sonship which the Apostle Paul described in the familiar and classic words of Romans viii. 15: "The Spirit Himself beareth joint witness with our spirit, that we are children of God." Here St. John puts the two testimonies in the reverse order, proceeding from the outward to the inward, from the ethical to the spiritual, from effect to cause and fruit to seed (cf. the use of σπέρμα for πνεῦμα θεοῦ in verse 9 above): first the practical and human evidence of loving deeds; next there is discovered, lying behind this activity and operating in it, the mystical and Divine evidence of the inbreathed, indwelling, personal spirit of Jesus Christ.

1. There is, first, *a reassuring discernment of one's own state of heart*, the honest self-consciousness of a true Christian love. "Lord, thou knowest all things,—thou knowest that I love thee": thus the chastened and sore heart of Peter "assured" itself beneath the searching eye and under the testing challenge of his Lord. In some matters St. Peter's self-knowledge had been woefully at fault; but he was sure of this as of his own existence, that he loved Jesus Christ, and he was sure that the Lord knew it. There was comfort, there was restoration in the fact that Christ questioned him on this one thing, and not

on other points where his answer must have been that of silence or bitter shame. In like manner the Christian man who faithfully loves Christ and His people and lays himself out for their service, gathers, directly and indirectly, a store of arguments against doubt, a fund of cheerful confidence and satisfaction in his faith, which no intellectual furnishing will supply.

“Love never faileth”.—never makes shipwreck of the faith that embarks on her adventures. When after years of Christian profession scepticism takes hold of a believer, it will commonly be found that his heart had grown cold to his brethren; he has forsaken their assemblings; he has turned his eyes away from their needs; he has been oblivious of the claims of his Church and his human fellows. If he “loveth not the brother whom he hath seen, he cannot love God whom he hath not seen”; and he has probably ceased to *love* God, before he ceased with assurance to believe in Him. When the reason is harassed with doubt, or the conscience troubled for old, forgiven sin, now seen in its darker meaning, it is time for the heart to go out afresh in works of pity toward the needy and “to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction.” Let it strengthen and draw closer the ties that link it to its kind, and the heart will come home to itself fraught with a new tender joy and peace in believing. Of many a difficulty of the Christian intellect it may be said, *Solvitur amando*. Yes, “we know that we are *of the truth*,” not because we have struck down in the sword-play of debate all the weapons of unbelief, or entrenched ourselves behind the artillery of a powerful dogmatism, or within the fortress of an infallible Church, but when we “love in deed and truth.” A true love will scarcely spring from a false faith. If faith *works* by love, it lives! There may be a degree of error, confusion of thought, defect of knowledge, infirmity of character attending such a faith; it may know little how to assert itself in

argument, how to conceive and express itself in terms of reason or forms of ritual, but if it loves much there is the core and heart of truth in it. The Church's martyrdoms and charities have been all through the ages and all over the world the practical evidence of her Divine character and the mark of her unity underlying so many deep divisions; and they supply a legitimate and needed reassurance to herself. The Apostle writes, "*We shall know*," thinking, as it seems, not of the present unsettlement alone, but of future assaults of doubt in the continued fight of faith.

This line of evidence was calculated to bring comfort to many of St. John's readers. False prophets were abroad amongst them, men who carried the credentials of a greater knowledge and a finer religious insight than themselves. They raised subtle questions of religious philosophy, baffling to simple-minded men. They threw doubt on the ordinary assumptions of faith; they insinuated distrust of the Apostle's competence to guide the advancing movements and deeper researches of Christian thought (see iv. 6, 2 John 9), on which the Church was called to enter by the progress of the times. It required, they said, profounder reasoning and a larger intellectual grasp than most Christians had imagined to reach the truth about God and the world, and to "know" indeed that one is "of the truth." New prophets had been raised up for the new age; "knowledge," and not "faith," must be the watchword of the coming era; the simple gospel of Peter and John must be wedded to the philosophy of the great thinkers and restated in terms of pure reason, if it was to satisfy man's higher nature and to command universal homage.

All this, pronounced with an air of grave conviction by men of philosophic garb and prestige, who yet named the name of Christ and posed as interpreters of His doctrine and mission, was calculated to make a power-

ful impression upon Greek Christianity. By the end of the first century Gnosticism had penetrated Graeco-Asian religious circles in all directions. Already rival communities were in existence outside the Apostolic Church (ii. 19), but claiming to hold the rational theory of Christianity and to represent the true mind of Christ. The prophets of this movement found their hearers amongst Catholic believers and strove incessantly to "draw away the disciples after them."

St. John's apologetic, his vindication in this Epistle of the Apostolic position against Gnostical heresy, runs upon the lines of St. Paul's retort to the intellectualists of Corinth: "You say, 'We have knowledge'? Very possibly: knowledge puffs up; it is *love* that builds up. If any man presumes on his *knowledge* in the things of God, he shows his ignorance; he has everything to learn. But if he *loves God*, God knows him for His own" (1 Cor. viii. 1-3). From the same standpoint St. John writes: "Every one that loves is begotten of God, and knows God . . . He that abides in love abides in God, and God abides in him" (iv. 7, 16). The emphasis with which the Apostle applies this criterion, and the manner in which from beginning to end he rings the changes upon this one idea, in the light of the polemical and defensive aim of the Letter, can only be understood on the assumption that the class of teachers whom he opposes were wanting in Christian qualities of heart, while they abounded in dialectical ability and theosophical speculation. It was an alien spirit and ethos that they would have brought into the Church; their temper vitiated equally their doctrine and their life. This St. John will proceed to show in the subsequent section of the Epistle, chap. iv. 1-6.

The expression "that we are *of the truth*" (ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας), St. John had used in chap. ii. 20, 21, saying that those who "have the anointing (the *chrism* that makes

Christians) from the Holy One" and "know the truth," know also that "no lie is of the truth." *Truth*—not lies—is the offspring of truth. Real love to God and man in us—for "*in this* we know that we are of the truth"—is the product of its reality in God; its genuineness of character proves its legitimacy of birth. Behind this wondrous widespread new creation of human kindness and tenderness, of unbounded self-surrender and unwearied service to humanity, which the Apostolic Churches exhibited, there is a *vera causa*. Only the recognition of a true Father-God, so loving men and making sacrifice for them as the Gospel declares, could account for the moral phenomenon to which the Apostle points and of which the readers themselves formed a living part. The love that had awakened and sustained in human hearts—once cold, selfish, impure—a response so powerful, was no illusion; and this response might prove, even to those who had not directly heard the summons of the Gospel, the existence of the Voice of grace to which it made reply.

The grand example of this phrase is the declaration of Jesus before Pilate: "Every one that is of *the truth* heareth My voice"! As much as to say, "The true heart knows its King when He speaks." There was a trace of something deep in the heart of Pilate, though he stifled it, that answered to this challenge; it would hardly have been given to a man wholly insensible. The two tests of true-heartedness—John's test and his Master's—coincide; to love our brethren and to honour and trust the Lord Jesus Christ are things that go together: nowhere is such love to men found as in the circle of Christ's obedience. Behind both lies *the truth*—the true being of the Father who sent His Son to win our faith, and who gives the Spirit of whom souls are born into the love of God and man. "This," St. John writes at the end, to crown all his witness,—"*this is the true God and eternal life*" (v. 20).

The Christian certainty, as it faces hostile speculation, is a conviction of the truth of God revealed in the message and person of Jesus Christ; but it has another, interior aspect confronting conscience and the accusations of past sin. Turning this way, St. John adds: "And we shall assure our hearts before Him (before God)"—*καὶ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πείσομεν τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν*. The rendering of this sentence has been much disputed; but the conflict of interpretation is now fairly decided. The verb *πείθω* has usually for its object some clause stating the fact, or belief, of which one is persuaded. Such an object is wanting here; for the assertion "that God is greater than our hearts" (*ὅτι . . . ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.*), which follows in verse 20, is not a truth of which we are or can be in any special way convinced "herein," viz. by loving our brethren and relieving their wants (*vv.* 16-18). There is nothing in this to prove God's superiority to "our heart,"—nor is it a fact that needs proof. The *ὅτι* of verse 20 is the *ὅτι* of *reason*, not of *statement*, and is not complementary to *πείσομεν*. The words "we shall persuade our heart" in this connexion, contain a complete sense in themselves, or, to put the same thing in other words, the object of *the thing* required by *πείσομεν* is implicit and goes without saying—it is suggested by the clause *ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ*, which brings the soul trembling into the presence of the Searcher of hearts: "We shall, on each occasion when the heart is assailed by accusing thoughts, convince ourselves on this ground that we are approved in His sight; we shall overcome our fears, and approach God with the lowly confidence of children accepted in His Son." Thus the *παρησία* with which faithful and loving Christians will meet Christ at His future coming (see *ii.* 28, *iv.* 17), is to be entertained now before God the ever-present Judge; this confidence is to be cherished on the same ground as the other, and is in fact identical with it. Such a "persuasion" the Apostle

Paul argues in Rom. v. 1, 2, viii. 14-17, and Eph. iii. 12, where he seeks to inspire Christian believers with filial trust toward God and urges them to "boldness of access" in coming to His presence.

The above-defined elliptical use of *πείθω*, with the meaning "soothe" or "reassure," is rare but well-established in Greek literature; a parallel instance of it occurs in Matthew xxviii. 14, where the Jewish rulers say to the soldiers who had watched at the grave of Jesus and dreaded the consequences of His escape: "If this come to the Governor's ears, *we will persuade (satisfy) him (scil. that you are not to blame) and rid you of care.*" St. John's meaning here is similar. His mind is dwelling not on the last judgement, but on the constant scrutiny of the heart by the Omniscient (*ὁ Θεὸς . . . γινώσκει πάντα*), before whom our sin testifies against us; thinking of His perfect knowledge and unerring judgement, each man is compelled in shame to say, "My sin is ever before me." "Love out of a pure heart" makes reply to this accusing voice, and restores to us "a good conscience" in the sight of God. In this consciousness the Apostle Paul could write to the Philippians, living habitually as he did in the light of the Judgement-throne: "God is my witness, how I long after you all, in the yearnings of Christ Jesus." The man who could thus speak and who lived daily and hourly under the constraint of the love of Christ, needed no other proof that he was in Christ. The very life of God glowed in his breast. Doubt of this would never cross his mind, any more than one doubts from waking to sleeping whether one is alive.

2. But the confidence toward God cherished by the believer who walks in love, is not self-generated nor acquired, in the first instance, by any process of reflexion. The facts on which it rests had a beginning external to the soul. The "well of water springing up" within the Christian heart and in the Christian Church, and pouring

out in so many streams of mercy and good fruits, has a fountain and source of replenishment lying deeper than man's own nature. The Apostle completes the Christian assurance and traces it to its spring in the testimony of the Holy Spirit, when he adds: "And in this we know that He (God) dwells in us, *from the Spirit which He gave us.*" Since the Holy Spirit is of God, and is God indeed, to have Him in the heart is to have *God dwelling in us*—the Spirit is God immanent (*μέλει ἐν ἡμῖν*); and to possess Him is, surely, to "*know that God dwells in us,*" forasmuch as "*the Spirit witnesseth,*" as the Apostles Paul and John both say (v. 6 f., Rom. viii. 15 f.). He is not an abstract influence or effluence from God, a voiceless Breath; but He "*searches the deeps of God*" (1 Cor. ii. 10), and the deeps of the heart that He visits; He "*teaches*"; He "*shows*" things present and to come—the things of Christ and the things of the conscience; He "*speaketh expressly*"; He "*testifies*" as He finds and knows. "*The Spirit that is of God*" knows whence He cometh, and whither He goes and He witnesseth of each to the other: He cries, sometimes (as St. Paul experienced) in groanings unspeakable but heard by the Heart-searcher, from the depths of the soul to God; but before that, by Himself entering and tenanting the heart He makes it known that God is there.

The abstract statement of the former ground of assurance, "*we are of the truth*"—a form of assertion common to all schools of thought claiming philosophic or religious certainty—is now exchanged for more specific and positive conception, by which *truth* translates itself into *life*: "*we know that God dwells in us.*" Thus intellectual conviction unfolds into a personal appropriation of the Divine by the human. The two are blended and identified in the recesses of the individual heart, where God finds man and man knows God; for the believer in Jesus Christ and lover of his kind "*dwells in God, and God in him*" (vv. 23, 24).

St. John affirms in this connexion once more the disciplinary element in Christian experience; he never allows us, for many paragraphs, to get away from the old, plain, matter-of-fact condition of fellowship with God: "he *that keeps His commandments* (ὁ τηρῶν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ: cf. ii. 3-5, 7 ff., 29, iii. 4 ff., v. 2 f., 18), dwells in God and God in him." Union between God and the creature is possible only on terms of the latter's *obedience*; and the path of obedience is marked by the fence of "the commandments." St. John knew the perils of mysticism; his own temperament would put him on his guard against this. Here lay, to many minds, the fascination of Gnosticism; this system promised an absorption in the Divine to be gained and maintained otherwise than in the hard way of self-denial and practical service and by attention to the routine details of "the commandments." These were identified by the new teaching with a coarse Judaism, with the realm of perishing matter and "the carpenter God" of the Hebrew Scriptures and the superseded Covenant of Works. Men who held themselves, in the emancipation of knowledge and the freedom of the sons of God, above the level of commandment-keeping, fell far below it, into gross carnal sin; and the raptures of a mystic love were not unfrequently associated with wild Antinomian licence. Such symptoms were marks, to St. John's mind, not of the Spirit of truth that God gave His people through Jesus Christ, who is a "spirit of power and love and discipline" (2 Tim. i. 7), but of "the spirit of Antichrist" and "of error" (iv. 3, 6). This spirit he discerned already at work in the pseudo-prophecies and immoral propaganda of Gnosticism.

"*From the Spirit*" (ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος) that God "gave us," rather than "*by the Spirit*" (τῷ πνεύματι: as in Rom. viii. 13 f., Gal. v. 16, 18) "we know" all this, as St. John puts it; for the assurance of the Christian believer rises from

this source, and begins from this time. Its origin was on the day of Pentecost. In the case of Christ's first disciples, the gift must be traced, more exactly, to the hour when, on His first appearance to His gathered Church after the resurrection the Lord Jesus "breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit" (John xx. 22). With this historical reference to the definitive bestowment of the Holy Spirit on the Church (cf. Luke xxiv. 49, Acts ii. 33, 38, xv. 8 f., xix. 2 ff., Gal. iii. 2 f., etc.)—the birth-hour of Christendom, which had its repetition in effect at the institution of each Christian community and the birth of each new Christian life—the Apostle writes *ἔδωκεν*, "He gave"—not *δίδωσιν*, as though defining of a continuous gift (cf. John iii. 34, 1 Thess. iv. 8). It was then that the exalted Christ "baptized" His people from heaven "in the Holy Spirit and fire." This was the nativity of the Christian consciousness; and it can have no repetition, since the life then originated can have no decease. It is rehearsed and reproduced, whenever any man, or people, or particular circle of men, is "baptized into Christ Jesus"; and the Lord Himself repeats, in despatching one or many on their life-mission, the benediction, "Receive the Holy Spirit: as my Father hath sent me, I also send you." Such a specific birth there has been, such a "giving" and "receiving" of the Holy Spirit, in every instance of spiritual life, whether the memory of it be distinct in recollection or otherwise. From this moment onwards "the Spirit witnesseth along with our spirit"—each witness living for and in the other. The Holy Spirit constitutes the universal consciousness of the sons of God. Our sense of the Divine indwelling, and all the assuring signs and works of grace, issue from Him who is the supreme gift of the Father, crowning the gift of His grace in the Son; and the Spirit's fruit is known in every gracious temper and kindly act and patient endurance of the Christian life.

II. The central part of the paragraph, verses 20–23, lying between the two grounds of assurance we have considered, remains to be discussed. It presents the contrasted cases arising under St. John's doctrine of assurance: *ἐὰν καταγινώσκη ἡμῶν ἡ καρδιά* (v. 20), the contingency of *self-accusation*; and *ἐὰν ἡ καρδιά μὴ καταγινώσκη ἡμῶν* (v. 21), the contingency of *self-acquittal*. The consequences of each condition are drawn out—in the former instance in broken and obscure words, by way of hint rather than clear statement (v. 20); on the other hand, the happy effects of a good conscience toward God are freely set forth in the language of verses 21–23.

1. The connexion of verses 19 and 20 affords one of the few grammatical ambiguities of this Epistle. It is an open question as to whether the first *ὅτι* of verse 20 is the ordinary conjunction, or is the relative pronoun, neuter of *ὅστις* (*ὅ,τι*), and complemented by *ἐάν* (for *ἄν*) of contingency¹; and whether the verses should be accordingly divided by a full stop as in the Authorized Version, or by a comma as in the Revised. This as to the point of verbal form. In point of matter, the question is: Does the Apostle say, “God is greater than our heart and knows all,” by way of *warning* to the over-confident and self-excusing, to those tempted to disregard their secret misgivings; or by way of *comfort* to the over-scrupulous and self-tormenting, to those tempted to brood over and magnify their misgivings? This is a nice problem of exegesis; and the displacement of the first of these alternatives by the second (R.V.), without a recognition of the other view in the margin, does not represent the balance of critical opinion. We retain the construction adopted by the older translators, without much hesitation. The stumbling-block of this interpretation is the second *ὅτι*, which is entirely superfluous (and is

¹ Cf. *δ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν* in v. 22 below, and *αἰτῶμεθα* in 15; *δ ἐὰν ἐργάσῃ* in 3 John 5; *ὅτι ἂν λέγῃ ὑμῖν*, John ii. 5; *ὅτι ἂν αἰτήσῃτε*, xiv. 13, etc.

accordingly ignored by the A.V.); there is no occasion to repeat the particle after so short an interval.¹ Moreover, while other conjunctions are apt to be resumptively doubled in a complex sentence, no other example is forthcoming of such repetition in the case of *ὅτι* ("that" or "because"). If this has actually happened here, it must be supposed that the second *ὅτι* (*μείζων ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.*) is due either to a "primitive error" of the copyists lying behind the oldest text, or to an inadvertence of the author, who thus betrays the mental perturbation caused by the painful supposition he is making. Not unfrequently, in writing as in speaking, under the weight of some solemn or anxious thought, the pen will hesitate, and a word may be unintentionally duplicated in the pause and reluctance with which the sentence is delivered.

On the other hand it must be insisted, as against the construction of the Revisers, that the grammatical subordination of verse 20 to verse 19 makes up an involved complex sentence, which is awkward in itself and of a type unusual with the writer; a sentence, too, that despite its elaboration leaves much to be read between the lines in order to bring a connected sense out of its entanglements. The fact of God's superiority to the heart and His perfect knowledge thereof does not, on the face of it, explain why love to the brethren should reassure the anxious Christian against self-accusations. Westcott's paraphrase, in quoting which we will bracket the matter read into John's text (upon the Revised construction), shows how lamely the writer, thus understood, has expressed his meaning, and that he has left the essential points to be supplied by the interpreter: "The sense within us of a sincere love of the brethren, which is the sign of God's

¹ The case is different in 1 Thess. iv. 1, for example, where *ἵνα* (in the true text) is reinserted to pick up the thread of the main sentence, after the long parenthesis extending from the first *καθὼς τοι παρ᾽ ἐμὲ*.

presence within us, will enable us to stay the accusations of our conscience, whatever they may be, because God [who gives us this love, and so blesses us with His fellowship], is greater than our heart; [and He], having perfect knowledge, [forgives all on which our heart sadly dwells].'

The above exposition is subtle, and contains a precious truth. But a great peril lies in the method of self-assurance which the Apostle is thus supposed to suggest,—the tendency to set sentiment against conscience. One may say: "I know I have done wrong. This act of deceit, this bitter temper or unholy imagination, my heart condemns. But I have many good and kind feelings, that, I am sure, come from God. My sin is but a drop in the ocean of His mercy, which I feel flowing into my heart. Charity covers a multitude of sins. Why should I vex myself about those faults of a weak nature, which God, who knows the worst, compassionates and abundantly pardons." The danger of extracting this anodyne from the text is one that, if it existed, St. John must have felt at once and would have been careful to guard against.

On the other view, identifying the two *ὅτι*'s, the grammatical construction becomes simple and obvious and the connexion of ideas sufficiently clear. The *ἐὰν καταγινώσκη* of verse 20 and the *ἐὰν μὴ καταγινώσκη* of verse 21 present, precisely in St. John's manner,¹ the two opposite hypotheses involved in the situation—that of *our heart condemning or not condemning us* in respect of love to the brethren. The former of these suppositions St. John is bound to make very seriously. The case he supposed in verses 17, 18, above, that of a pretender to the love of God wanting in human compassion, was not imaginary (see iv. 20; cf. i. 6, ii. 1). There is nothing of which he shows himself more apprehensive in his readers than a vain assurance reconciling the

¹ Cf. the double *ἐάν* clauses of i. 6, 7, and again of vv. 8–10; also in John xv. 4, 6, 7, etc.

heart with sin, a light and superficial satisfying of the conscience. That any one should "persuade his heart" in *this* way, is the last thing the Apostle would desire. At each step he balances encouragement with caution; he cheers and humbles us at once. The condition of the Church indicated by the Epistle is a troubled one; we see love and hatred, light and darkness, in conflict even there. Real ground existed for self-condemnation on the part of some of St. John's little children, while there was ground for comfort and satisfaction in many others.

And when he supposes "our heart condemning us," the *tense* of the verb (ἐὰν καταγινώσκῃ) makes the hypothesis still more alarming: it is the Greek *present* of continuous action, and implies not a passing or occasional cloud over the soul's happiness, but a persistent shadow, a repeated or sustained protest of conscience. This is no mere misgiving of a sensitive nature jealous of itself, to be justly dispelled by the reassuring consciousness of a cordial love to the brethren. Rather it is the opposite of such assurance; it is condemnation upon the vital and testing point. The man aimed at in verse 20, if we read the passage aright, is one who does not "know" by St. John's token that he is "of the truth"; his heart cannot honestly give him such testimony, but "keeps accusing him" on this very account. He knows that he has "loved in word and tongue" more than "in deed and truth" (v. 18), that he has "shut up his compassions" from brethren in distress (v. 17), if he has not positively indulged the hate which brands men as murderers in the sight of God (v. 15). If his own ignorant and partial heart thus condemns him, let him consider what must be the verdict of the all-remembering and all-holy Judge. The argument is *a minori ad majus*, from the echo to the voice it reproduces, from the forebodings of conscience to the Supreme Tribunal and the sentence of the Great Day.

Even when a man's heart absolves him, he may not for this reason presume on God's approval: "I know nothing against myself," writes St. Paul, "yet not on this ground am I justified. But He that trieth me is the Lord" (1 Cor. iv. 4). How much more must one fear, when the heart holds him guilty! Little or nothing is read into the passage when it is thus construed, and viewed in the light of the foregoing context. The stern discrimination of verses 15-18, between the lover of his brethren who has passed into life and the hater who abides in death, was bound to come to a head in some such conclusion as this, by which the latter is virtually cited to God's awful judgement-seat. The principle applied is that powerfully set forth by our Lord Himself in the great Judgement-scene of Matthew xxv.,—viz. that deeds of true human charity warrant a good hope of admittance into God's eternal kingdom, while the absence of them awakens the darkest fears.

2. The relief with which St. John passes from the supposition *ἐὰν καταγινώσκη ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν* to its opposite, is shown by the compellation *ἀγαπητοί* (used before in chaps. ii. 7, iii. 2: both passages of high feeling) with which he turns to address the body of his readers. The sentence "Beloved, if our heart condemn us not," marks the glad escape from the thought of condemnation clouding verse 20; we pass from shadow into sunlight. After the brief warning against a false peace—against soothing and doctoring the conscience when it warns us that our hearts are not right with our brethren—the Apostle returns with emphasis to the reassuring strain of verse 19, which he now expands into the exultant testimony of verses 21 and 22. In almost any other writer the transition would have been marked by the conjunction *δέ*; but to this Apostle the Hebrew idiom is natural, which simply opposes its contrasts without link-words. See e.g., chaps. i. 8-10, iii. 2, 13 f., iv. 4 ff., etc.; but *δέ* in i. 6 f.

If self-reproach for heartlessness toward men raises fear of God's displeasure, self-acquittal on this ground, if justified, reflects in the heart God's approving smile. This approval, the logical complement of *ἐὰν ἡ καρδία μὴ καταγινώσκη ἡμῶν*, is stated, not directly but by its two manifest consequences, in verses 21*b*, 22*a*: *παρησίαν ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν καὶ ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν λαμβάνομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*, "We have confidence (or freedom) toward God and whatsoever we ask we receive from Him." The reasons given for this confidence and experience of answered prayers, in verse 22*b*, recall us to the great condition of commandment-keeping, on which St. John loses no opportunity of insisting; they intimate that such obedience pleases God indeed, so that the heart's self-acquittal is warranted by the Divine approbation: "because we keep His commandments, and do the things pleasing in His sight." Once more, the commandments are summarized in brotherly love (*v.* 23, cf. *ii.* 4-11); but to this is prefixed the duty in the fulfilment of which love to one's brethren has its beginning and best incentive: "that we should believe the name of His Son Jesus Christ, and love one another as He gave us commandment." We thus find a two-fold sign of God's favour toward the true Christian man (*vv.* 21*b*, 22*a*), and a two-fold ground for such continued favour in the man himself (*v.* 23).

There accrues (1) to the heart that loves its brethren an habitual *παρησία πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*,¹ the earnest of that which the faithful servant of Christ will realize at His glorious coming (*ii.* 28). This *confidence* is the light from within the soul of God's own peace (cf. *Rom.* v. 1 f.); it is the sunshine of the open heavens shining upon the Church; the *freedom* of happy children who bear an unclouded spirit and have access always to the Father, speaking to Him with a trustful heart and no longer checked and chided in His

¹ On *παρησία*, see the references in the fourth of these Papers (June 1904).

presence. Here lies the secret (2) of *successful prayer* (cf. v. 14 f.),¹ the same that was revealed by our Lord to His disciples (John xv. 7) : “ If you abide in me and my words abide in you, whatever you will, ask, and it will be done for you.” The prayers are always heard of those who have the mind of Christ, who love the Lord’s work and are one with Him in heart and will. They ask the things He means to give. The Spirit of Christ prays in them ; they cannot ask amiss or fruitlessly. They plead truly in Christ’s “ name ” (cf. John xv. 16)—in His character and on His behalf, who has no interests but those inspired by God’s goodwill to men.

“ The secret of Jehovah,” the Old Testament said, “ is with them that fear Him.” John had discovered that this secret also rests with those who love their brethren. No veil hides from them the Father’s face. Their prayers are prophecies of what God will do ; “ for everyone that loveth is begotten of God, and *knoweth God* ” (iv. 7). “ Whatsoever we ask we receive of Him ”—the holy Apostle is not formulating a theological principle but telling his actual experience—“ because we keep His commands, and do the things *pleasing before Him*.” Now there is nothing which better pleases God, who is love, than to see His children live in love toward each other. And nothing more quickly clouds our acceptance with the Father, and more effectually hinders our prayers, than churlishness and strife. When our hearts condemn us on this score, we have much to fear from God ; when they condemn us not, we have everything to hope. “ The Father Himself loveth you,”

¹ The immediate connexion, lying in the nature of things, and directly asserted in the parallel passage above cited between *confident address* to God and *successful petition*, is destroyed by the stop interposed by the English Version (A.V. or R.V.) to sunder these two clauses. The division of verses tends to create an artificial division of *sense*. The double *ετι* clause in the sequel goes to support *both* the above sentences together—*παρησιαν ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ ὁ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν λαμβάνομεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ*.

said Jesus once to His disciples, "because you have loved me and have believed that I came out from the Father" (John xvi. 27). The terms on which the Apostle guarantees to his readers God's abiding favour—faith in Christ's name, and mutual love—are tantamount to the above;—for true love to Christ and love to His own in the world, to the Bridegroom and to the Bride, are the same affection; He and His Church are one to the love born of faith, as they are one to the hate of unbelief (John xv. 18-25).

In laying down the *ἐντολαί* of God, the keeping of which keeps us in the way of His good pleasure, St. John gives to the idea of "commandment" a surprising turn, of which there is an anticipation in the unique saying of John vi. 29: "This is the work of God, that you believe on Him whom He sent." Can faith then be *commanded*? is it, after all, a *work* of law? The two conceptions of "faith" and "works," in St. Paul's theology, stand in radical opposition and represent the true and false ways of salvation respectively. Right and just "work" or "works," as he views the matter, are the fruit and consequence of faith and by no means identical with it (1 Thess. i. 3, 2 Thess. i. 11, Tit. iii. 8). For St. Paul's thought was ruled by the antithesis of the legalist controversy, in which "works" meant self-wrought and would-be meritorious human doings. For St. John this contention is past; and he never made it his own, as the Apostle of the Gentiles was compelled to do.

That God *requires* men to believe was a commonplace with both Apostles; and John's *ἐντολή* here is not essentially different from Paul's *κλήσις*, the summons that is sent out to mankind in the Gospel, demanding from all nations the "*obedience* of faith." It was in the imperative mood that the Lord Jesus opened His own commission, when He "came into Galilee preaching the good news of God, and saying, 'Repent and believe in the good news.'" Faith cannot be commanded as a mechanical

work, a thing of constraint; it can be and is commanded as the dutiful response of man's will to the appeal of God's truth and love. Hence "the commandments" resolve themselves into "the commandment" (*αἱ ἐντολαί* of verse 22=*ἡ ἐντολή*, verse 23)—two in one—"that we believe the name of His Son Jesus Christ and love one another." The phrase is not "believe in," or "on, the name" (*εἰς, ἐν, ἐπί*), as commonly, but "believe *the name*":¹ the Name has something to say; it speaks for the nature and claims of Him who bears it, and utters God's testimony concerning His Son. God asks our credence for the record that is affirmed when he designates Jesus Christ "My Son." He bids all men yield assent to the royal titles of Jesus and make that name high above every other in their estimate and purpose, the sovereign object of trust and obedience. This faith in Jesus as Lord and Christ always works by love, and carries with it the result already described—the specific matter of Christian law: "that we love one another, as He gave us command" (see John xiii. 34, etc.).

The verbs "believe" and "love" are here, according to the preferable reading² (*πιστεύωμεν*), in different tenses—the former in the aorist pointing to an event, the latter in the present tense signifying a practice. As Westcott puts it, "The decisive act of faith is the foundation of the abiding work of love." The keeping of this double law, of faith and love, ensures that mutual indwelling of God and the soul which is the essence of religion, for "the man that keeps His command dwells in God, and God in him." Faith, as Christ and all His Apostles teach, is the channel of that intercourse; it forms the link of an eternal attachment between the soul and its Maker.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

¹ *Πιστεύω* takes a dative of the *person* believed; and *τὸ ὄνομα* is virtually personified by the use of this construction.

² *Πιστεύωμεν* is, however, the reading of some good MSS. and leading editors.

AGAIN THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE LAST VERSES OF MARK.

IN the EXPOSITOR for March 1905 (No. lxiii., series vi.), I gave reasons for the belief that the new text of the *pericope adulterae* of Professor Conybeare's Edschmiadzin codex, while really representing, as conjectured by the discoverer, the form found in Papias and described by Eusebius as an anecdote of "a woman accused of many sins before the Lord" (cf. the Edschmiadzin text: "A certain woman was taken in sins, against whom all bore witness"), is not earlier, but later than, and dependent on the well-known form of the received text; whereas this common form is probably that which Eusebius found "contained in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*." This, if true, lends additional interest and value to the Armenian codex in question, since it practically affords a new Papias fragment. The Armenian scribe John will have had access directly, or more probably, indirectly, to Papias, and the evidence thus afforded goes to show the dependence of Papias—or rather of Papias' Palestinian authorities "the Elders"—on the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, a notoriously Palestinian source.

These inferences having drawn forth no reply from Professor Conybeare or others may perhaps be assumed to have a certain degree of *prima facie* validity. I venture to offer, accordingly, certain further considerations in regard to the same codex, which relate to its testimony on a much more important point, and one now very generally accepted. These considerations, however, are unfortunately adverse to its reliability.

The articles of Zahn and Resch translated by Professor Conybeare for the *EXPOSITOR* (iv. 10, 1894, pp. 219-232), and that of Harnack in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* with Hilgenfeld's comments in the *Zeitschrift für wiss. Theologie*¹ represent varying views of the identity of the Ariston to whom the codex attributes the authorship of Mark xvi. 9-20. Hilgenfeld alone, in accordance with his singular advocacy of the authenticity of the verses, refuses to see a reference to the authority referred to by Papias,² though he identifies the Aristion spoken of by Papias with Ariston of Pella, an author quoted at some length by Eusebius (*H.E.* iv. vi.) as reporting the overthrow of Jerusalem by Hadrian in 135 A.D.

The "Presbyter Ariston" of the new codex he sharply distinguishes from the "nicht-Presbyter" of Papias. The title in his view of the Papias fragment being applicable to "John," to distinguish him from the Apostle, but not to "Aristion." His explanation of the codex datum is "Von irgend einem Presbyter Ariston vor etwa 500 wird Mk. xvi. 9-20 in einer syrischen Handschrift, welcher der Schreiber der armenischen gefolgt ist, entlehnt sein." Zahn, Harnack and Rohrbach adopt substantially the discoverer's view of the inserted title "Of the Elder Ariston," considering that the authorship of the appendix to Mark is now completely established. Resch, like Hilgenfeld, thinks it impossible to identify "the Elder Ariston" with the "Aristion" of Papias, but his conclusion is that we must attribute the appendix of Mark to Ariston of Pella, the same Ariston of Pella being, according to a seventh-century scholion by Maximus Confessor on the work *De mystica Theol.* (cap. i. p. 17, ed. Corderii), author of the Jewish-Christian *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus*.

¹ Review of Rohrbach (*Schluss des Mkevang.*) in the issue of 1894, p. 627.

² *Ap. Eusebius, H.E.* iii., xxxix. 4. In the Syriac and Armenian translations of Eusebius the name is spelled uniformly "Ariston."

Of all these critics not one save Zahn seems to have considered the possibility that the Armenian title might be based on misinformation or false conjecture, and even Zahn's momentary hesitation is almost immediately dismissed. In the translation of his article by Professor Conybeare we read as follows (p. 222) :—

Now who is this Ariston? Conybeare has quite rightly rejected the idea of Ariston of Pella. It is quite true that Moses of Chorene had plenty of fables to narrate about him (ii. 60), and we could not avoid thinking of him, if Langlois (*Coll. of Arm. Hist.*, i. 391; ii. 110, n. 3) were right in ascribing to Moses the statement that Ariston was secretary of the Bishop Mark, of Jerusalem, in the time of Hadrian.

If that were so the completer of the Second Gospel must have been identified with the Secretary of the Evangelist Mark, and also (accordingly?) have received the name Ariston. Langlois, however, seems to me to have made a mistake. For Moses has in view an Ariston who was secretary of Adrian, and was sent by him to Persia, cf. also Lauer's translation, p. 118. Ariston of Pella, who wrote his dialogue "Jason and Papiscus" after 135, and perhaps a good deal later, cannot be the author of a section, which Tatian already read in his Mark at the latest in 170, and which Justin had already known, so it would seem, as early as 150, though perhaps not as an integral part of the Gospel of Mark. There remains no other but the Aristion who was one of Papias' authorities (Eus., *H.E.* iii. xxxix. 4, 6, 7, 14).

Had Zahn, after coming so close to it, given real consideration to the third possibility of an Ariston who was neither the Elder (?) Aristion of Papias, nor Ariston of Pella, but a conjectural combination of the two in the mind of a tenth century Armenian scribe familiar, as every intelligent Armenian must be, with Moses of Chorene, the critical world might not have accepted so generally, as at present appears to be the case, the idea that "Conybeare's discovery has given the final solution of the problem" of the authorship of the appendix to Mark.

To show that this third, unconsidered possibility is after all the most probable, and that the authorship of the Markan appendix is therefore a problem just as completely

unsolved as before, we must first of all make certain corrections of Zahn's statements.

In his belief that Langlois misunderstands Moses in taking Ariston to be secretary of the Bishop Mark of Jerusalem, Zahn is manifestly right. Langlois' own rendering is as follows, his [] indicating that the name Ariston de Pella is supplied:—

Vers le même temps Hadrien envoya de grandes forces en Assyrie, et ordonna à notre Ardaschès d'aller en Palestine (*sic*) avec les nobles de sa garde. [Ariston de Pella] qui nous a transmis cette relation, était attaché à sa personne comme secrétaire.

The name Ariston of Pella is properly supplied, for the whole section opens: "Ce que raconte Ariston de Pella touchant la mort d'Ardaschès est vraiment digne d'intérêt."¹ Moses inserts thereafter the Ariston fragment from Eusebius, *H.E.* iv. vi., winding it up with the statement, derived of course from Eusebius, that Hadrian established in Jerusalem a community of "pagans and Christians, whose bishop was Mark." This extract, however, is a mere aside from his main purpose, which is to relate the death and imposing obsequies of his hero Ardaces. Consequently he proceeds in immediate sequence: "About the same time Hadrian sent great forces into Assyria and sent our Ardaces to Persia together with his retainers. He who has transmitted to us this narrative [of the death and obsequies] was attached to his (?) person as secretary."

It should not require the evidence of later Armenian tradition, which describes Ariston of Pella as "the secretary of Ardaces," to show what Moses means. Rightly or

¹ Cf. the rendering of Le Vaillant de Florival, *Hist. Arm.* ii. 57 (Ed. of Whiston, ii. 60): "Vers le même temps Adrien envoya de grandes forces en Assyrie et ordonna à notre Ardaschès d'aller en Perse (*sic*) avec ses surintendants. Attaché à sa personne en qualité de gardenotes (secrétaire) celui qui nous a donné cette histoire rencontre Ardaschès en Médie," etc.

wrongly he identifies the author from whom he derives his description of the death and obsequies of his principal hero with the Ariston of Pella from whom Eusebius had quoted before him. This extract may be subjoined (in Langlois' translation) since it is unknown, save for Moses' quotation, and throws perhaps some light upon the problematical Ariston of Pella.

Il [Ariston] rencontra Ardaschès en Médie, dans un endroit appelé Sohount. Il est dit qu'Ardaschès tomba malade à Marant, dans le bourg de Pagouraguerd. . . . L'historien [Ariston ?] raconte en détail le nombre de personnes qui périrent à la mort d'Ardaschès, ses femmes bien aimées, ses concubines et ses esclaves dévoués, etc.

Langlois, accordingly, is quite wrong in connecting "sa personne" with the Bishop Mark of Jerusalem, although the mistake is easy. Zahn, however, is equally wrong in taking it to be Hadrian. Moses gives Ariston's close relation to *Ardaces* because it supports his account of the death and obsequies. The account seems in reality to reflect the personal observation of an eye-witness, and contains nothing more "fabulous" than the statement that Ardaces on falling ill at Marant dispatched a certain Apéghe, described (by Aristo ?) as "energetic, astute, and a flatterer," to the shrine of Artemis in Êriza, asking for healing and a long life, but when the courtier returned the king was already dead.

Why should it be treated as an absurdity when Moses of Chorene, the reputed translator of the Gospels and of the Church History of Eusebius from the Syriac, and the first and greatest historian of Armenia, supposes himself in the account aforesaid to be quoting the same Ariston of Pella from whom Eusebius had given the account of Hadrian's treatment of Jerusalem ?¹ The only grounds adduced for questioning his statement are that the work

¹ Hilgenfeld well defends the reliability of this statement of Moses in *Zts f. w. Th.* for 1883, p. 8 ff.

of Ariston does not appear to have long survived its use by Eusebius (Moses of Chorene wrote about 125 years later), and that the scholiast Maximus Confessor ascribed to this same Ariston of Pella the early Jewish-Christian *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus*. But this late ascription is far from probable. All the other authorities from whom we learn anything concerning this dialogue treat it as if anonymous, so that even the critics who accept the statement of Maximus are obliged to assume that in earlier times the dialogue had generally circulated in anonymous form. Thus Jerome, though twice quoting the dialogue, makes no mention of its author in his catalogue of Christian writers, and Eusebius, who quotes Ariston's account of the Jewish war of Hadrian, omits all reference to him as the author of any Christian work.

Per contra a Decapolis writer of this very unusual¹ name, and (most probably) of this same period,² is known to Stephanus of Byzantium, who enumerates first among the literary celebrities native to Gerasa (less than twenty miles from Pella) "Ariston the cultured rhetorician."³ From Pella he knows of none. One can scarcely sum up the case otherwise than to say, The evidence for the existence of a Christian writer Ariston is late and meagre in the extreme, the unsupported statement of Maximus to this effect being opposed to what we should infer from earlier and better authorities. The quotation of Eusebius, on the other hand, positively assures us that a historical writer, Ariston of Pella, Jew, Christian or Pagan, gave a contemporary account of Hadrian's campaign against Jeru-

¹ It occurs in the proper Greek form Ἀριστίων as the name of one or two obscure characters in Greek literature (see Pape s.v.) and in the form Ἀρίστων in an inscription of the first century found near Jaffa. Cf. Ganneau, *Arch. Res. in Pal.* ii. p. 150. Other occurrences are unimportant.

² Greek inscriptions from this region are infrequent after the second century.

³ Πήτωρ ἀστέιος. See Steph. Byz., s.v. Γέρασα.

salem. We are credibly informed that in conjunction with it he gave an account of the death and obsequies of Ardaces king of Armenia, whom Hadrian had dispatched against the Parthians, and we have mention of an ἀστειὸς ῥήτωρ Ἀρίστων of Gerasa who may possibly be the same. That the anonymous Jewish-Christian dialogue employed about 160 A.D. by Celsus and known to Origen and Clement as the *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus* should several centuries later come to be ascribed to this second-century littérateur of the Decapolis would be no unprecedented instance of involuntary Christian baptism.¹

We propound then as the real explanation of the inserted title "Ariston Eritzou" of the Edschmiadzin codex, the theory that the tradition is no older than the scribe, or διορθωτής, of the codex itself, who wrote in A.D. 989, and arises simply from the ambiguous phrase of Moses of Chorene, which Langlois has understood as declaring "that Ariston was secretary of the Bishop Mark, of Jerusalem, in the time of Hadrian." That a tenth century Armenian scribe should take the Ariston of Pella whose description of the overthrow of Jerusalem he found quoted by Eusebius, and who further appeared to be designated by Moses the "father" of Armenian history, as "the secretary of Mark, Bishop of Jerusalem," to be the completer of the Gospel of Mark is nothing extraordinary. The verses Mark xvi. 9-20 themselves were attached as an unauthentic postscript, in accordance with Armenian tradition, which follows old-Syriac authority in omitting Mark xvi. 9-20. Just as in the case of the *pericope adulterae*, which was also, as it were, appended in [], with the marginal note, "The

¹ The datum of *Chron. Pasch.* (Ed. Dindorf, p. 477) attributing to the year 134 the delivery to Hadrian of an *Apology* by Ἀπελλῆς καὶ Ἀρίστων, ὃν μέμνηται Εὐσέβιος κτλ., has long been recognized as a pure blunder for ὁ Πελλαῖος Ἀρίστων; but the name Ariston of Pella would not have been substituted for "Aristides," the real author of the *Apology*, if the process of transforming the "cultured rhetorician" and "historian" of Decapolis into a Christian apologist had not already begun.

things concerning the adulteress," so here an interlined scholion, manifestly crowded in after the completion of the copyist's work, but before the manuscript had left the scriptorium, explained the unwonted addition as the work of "The Presbyter Ariston." In spite of Hilgenfeld, however, we cannot conceive the insertion of such a title to be independent of the Papias excerpt in Eusebius, *H.E.* iii. xxxix. 4. These verses, to appear entitled even to such a quasi-canonical position as the scribe has given them, would have to be attributed to some authority only second to the Apostles themselves. Appended as first written, without a separate title, but separated by several devices from the rest of the Gospel, they suggested for themselves a derivation from some anonymous "secretary" or completer of Mark. With the subsequent addition "Ariston Eritzou" they obtained a somewhat higher sanction. Their presence in so exalted a position, contrary to orthodox Armenian tradition, was excused by ascription to the famous Elder on whom Papias had depended. No obstacle appeared to the identification, because in the Syriac and Armenian "Ariston" (not "Aristion") is the name of the Elder in question.

Nothing can so strongly support the view just stated of the origin of this title as the photographic facsimile of the page, given on p. cv. of Swete's *Commentary on Mark*. Professor Conybeare himself furnishes the accompanying description, from which we transcribe the following:—

In this codex verse 8 of ch. xvi. ends at the beginning of a line, in the second column of a page. The line is partly filled up with the vermilioned flourishes which indicate that the Gospel proper of Mark is ended. Verse 9 however is begun on the next line, and the whole 12 verses are completed in the same large uncials as the rest of the Gospels. As it were by an afterthought the scribe adds the title *Ariston Eritzou* just above the flourishes mentioned, and within the columnar space. It is written in vermilioned smaller uncials identical in character with those which at the foot of each column denote the Ammonian canons, and also with those which the scribe uses to

complete a word at the end of a line, thereby preserving the symmetry of the lines and avoiding the necessity of placing the last one or two letters of a word by themselves at the beginning of a fresh line. The title therefore was added by the first hand; or, if not by him, at least by the διορθωτής. In any case, it is contemporary *and must have stood in the older copy transcribed*, from which also were perhaps transferred the fifth century full-page illuminations included in the existing codex. At first it was intended to omit the title, but on second thoughts it was added. If the scribe had from the first meant to keep it, he would have left room for it, instead of cramping it in above the terminal flourishes. That he regarded Mark proper as ending with verse 8, is further shown by the large circular boss consisting of concentric circles of colour added against the end of verse 8 between the columns.

The whole case for the widely accepted view of Professor Conybeare rests upon the words I have italicized in the above extract "must have stood in the older copy transcribed." But on what does this inference rest?

The suggested possibility that the omission of the appendix from our earliest authorities might be due to the presence of some such title τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἀρίστωνος, can scarcely be called a reason. The verses, when attached at all in the more ancient Armenian MSS., are included between the subscription Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον placed after both verse 8 and verse 20 (W. H. *Notes*, *l.c.*), and Greek MSS. gave similar indications of their secondary authority. Even had there been no such tradition the mere fact that another form of the ending was known to be in circulation would account for an obelizing or cancellation of the suspected material. In attaching the appendix after a space filled out by terminal flourishes and other indications that "he regarded Mark proper as ending with verse 8," the scribe is simply showing his regard for Syriac and Armenian tradition, which rejected the verses, while at the same time he yields to the increasing pressure of later Greek usage. As with the *pericope adulterae*, while he feels obliged for completeness' sake to take up the unwonted material, he records his (supposed) knowledge of their real

derivation in the scholion "cramped in above the terminal flourishes." The text, as Professor Conybeare notes, has no very noticeable variants from the Greek text of Westcott and Hort. The appendix, then, is from the common Greek tradition. Its secondary position is accounted for by the standard Armenian practice. But what is there to indicate that the title *Ariston Eritzou* was "transcribed from the older text employed"?

One exceedingly interesting item is adduced by Professor Conybeare, which, so far as it goes, tends to confirm the ascription of the appendix of our Second Gospel to Papias' Aristion. "In a 12th century Bodleian Codex of Rufinus' Latin version of the *Ecclesiastical History* (of Eusebius) this story (how Justus called Barsabas 'drank off a deadly drug and yet suffered no ill effects because of the grace of the Lord') is mentioned in the margin against the name of Aristion (in p. 136, 31), from which we may suppose that the scholiast of Rufinus regarded the story as in a peculiar manner due to, or suggested by Aristion."¹ If Professor Conybeare is here correct in both his observation and inferences, the scholiast of Rufinus might not unreasonably be assumed to have imbibed somewhere the idea of Aristion as author of Mark xvi. 9-20; for the resemblance between Mark xvi. 18 and the tale of Papias regarding Barsabas is too close to be accidental. We shall then have two witnesses, but by no means necessarily independent witnesses, for the currency of the idea. It remains to be shown, however, that it was really the scholiast's intention to indicate Aristion as the author of this tale,² and that his grounds for this belief, if he entertained it, were connected with a belief in Mark xvi. 18 being also by Aristion, which

¹ EXPOSITOR, iv. viii., 1893, p. 246.

² We venture the query whether it is not rather the name "the Elder John," alongside that of Aristion, against which the reference to the drinking a cup of poison with impunity was written, the scholiast having in mind the well known exploit attributed to "John."

belief in turn rested on some better authority than a scribe's conjecture. Until something further is vouchsafed in respect to this scholion it can hardly be considered to establish much of a probability that "Aristion" was the actual author of Mark xvi. 18, and that the remembrance of this fact hidden for almost a millennium suddenly reappeared in the "afterthought" of an Armenian scribe.

How much of improbability is really involved in the supposition is made clear by no other than Zahn himself:—

Now it would be an extremely improbable assumption that the composer of the appendix to Mark should have actually named Aristion as his authority, either in a prefatory title or in a marginal notice. If he did, how can we explain the fact that the notice was lost and disappeared from the hundreds of copies in which that appendix has been transmitted to us, so that we had no trace of it until the Edschmiadzin Gospel was discovered? A learned notice of the kind is quite out of keeping with the style of Mark xvi. 9–20.

Zahn's explanation is that:—

A learned man of the fourth or fifth century, who was interested in the question of the origin of Mark xvi. 9–20, because he did not find the section in all copies, who also knew the work of Papias and found in it a *Diegesis* of Aristion's, essentially the same with Mark xvi. 14–18, availing himself of his information, entered on the margin of his copy of the Gospels the words Ἀριστίωνος πρεσβυτέρου. This notice may then have gained currency over a small range, and have made its way to Armenia among other places.

In other words, Zahn is obliged to assume, just as we are, that the notice rests upon pure conjecture, only, accepting Professor Conybeare's unsupported assumption that it "must have stood in the older copy transcribed," he takes a leap backward of 500 years in the dark, and instead of an Armenian scribe misunderstanding the actually surviving passage of Moses of Chorene which seems to say that Aristo of Pella was the secretary of Mark, he substitutes a learned man, comparing a supposititious passage of Papias with Mark xvi. 14–18.

A further coincidence which might have been but has

not been adduced in favour of common authorship for the appendix to Mark and the *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus* is that Celsus in 160 and Jerome in 375 both employ the two, Jerome in particular evincing, as Zahn justly argues, acquaintance with a longer and more original form of the text in Mark xvi. 14 f. than any known to us. But few who have studied the problem of the Dialogue will be disposed to look in it for the source of the appendix. What we have now presented should suffice to prove that even if Ariston of Pella were proved to be its author the reasons are but slight for regarding Ariston of Pella or Papias' Ariston, or any other of the name, as author of Mark xvi. 9-20.

BENJ. W. BACON.

THE PROBLEM OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN.

THE object of this paper is to discuss the question whether the Second Epistle of St. John was written to a literal Mother and Children or whether it was addressed to some Church personified as a Mother with her Children.

These two opposing theories may for convenience be distinguished as the *literal* and the *figurative* hypotheses.

Opinion has been much divided on this question. Thus, without attempting to give an exhaustive list, Alford, together with the contributors in the *Speaker's Commentary* and in Ellicott's Commentary, support the literal hypothesis. On the other hand Meyer and Wordsworth are in favour of the figurative theory. The latter view was also taken by Lightfoot and Westcott. Thus Lightfoot wrote: "I take the view that the *κνρία* addressed in the 2nd Epistle of St. John is some Church personified, as indeed the whole tenor of the Epistle seems to imply." (*Commentary on Colossians and Philemon*, p. 303 note.)

And again : "The Second Epistle of St. John presents a close parallel (to 1 Peter v. 13). A salutation is sent in the opening verse to the elect lady (ἐκλεκτῇ κυρία) : at the close is a message, 'the children of thine elect sister. (τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς) salute thee.' The intermediate language shows that we have here the personification of the Communities, etc. (Clement of Rome, vol. ii. p. 491)."

Westcott, while holding that "the problem of the address is insoluble with our present knowledge," thought that "the general tenor of the letter favours the opinion that it was sent to a community and not to one believer." (See his *Commentary on the Epistles of St. John*, p. 224.)

The word κυρία, 2 John 1.

It is undeniable that the most obscure word in the Epistle has hitherto been the word κυρία in 2 John 1. Since the commentary of Westcott appeared light has been thrown upon the usage of this word from an unexpected quarter. In an article which appeared in the EXPOSITOR for March, 1901, Professor Rendel Harris showed that the Oxyrynchus Papyri furnish examples of an idiomatic use of κύριος in letters. Thus he quotes Papyrus No. cxii., which runs as follows :—χαίροις, κυρία μου Σερηνία, παρὰ Πετοσείριος. Πᾶν ποιήσον, κυρία, ἐξελθεῖν τῇ κ' τοῖς γενεθλίοις τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ δῆλωσόν μοι ἢ πλοῖφ' ἐξέρχει ἢ ὄνφ' ἵνα πεμφθῇ σοι ἀλλ' ὅρα μὴ ἀμελήσης, κυρία. ἔρρωσθαί σε εὐχομαι πολλοῖς χρόνοις. In this letter what is important to observe is not only that κυρία is used by itself, but that it is joined with the proper name Σερηνία.

Two more instances of a similar use of κύριος occur in Papyrus No. cxiii. The opening words of the letter are κυρίῳ μου νίφ Διονυσοθέωνι ὁ πατήρ χαίρειν. And the letter ends ἔρρωσθαί σε εὐχομαι πολλοῖς χρόνοις κύριε νιέ. Here κύριος is joined with νιός precisely as κυρία with Σερηνία in the first instance.

The evidence for the idiomatic use of *κύριος* in letters is not however limited to the Oxyrynchus Papyri. There is an idiomatic use in letters by Christian writers of the 3rd century A.D.

Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, towards the close of a letter to the Church of Antioch, writes as follows:—*ταῦτα δὲ ὑμῖν, κύριοί μου ἀδελφοί, τὰ γράμματα ἀπέστειλα διὰ Κλήμεντος τοῦ μακαρίου πρεσβύτερου.* (Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* ii. p. 165.)

So Africanus, Bishop of Emmaus, begins a letter to Origen with the words:—*χαῖρε, κύριέ, μου καὶ υἱέ καὶ πάντα τιμιώτατε Ωρίγενες, παρὰ Ἀφρικανοῦ* (*Rel. Sac.* p. 225).

No comment is needed on the use of *κύριοι* in the first of these two instances. With regard to the second example it may be noticed that the *κύριε*, though separated from *Ωρίγενες* by the insertion of *υἱέ* and *τιμιώτατε*, may quite well belong to it.

Thus it may be regarded as established that *κύριος* could in letters be used idiomatically, joined with some such word as “son” or “brother” or with a proper name. It is at least possible therefore that we have in 2 John an instance of a similar use.

It may be remarked in passing that if this view be taken it must not be regarded as proved that the Epistle was “a real letter written to a real woman.”¹ It is quite conceivable that the writer used the idiom even on the hypothesis that the Epistle was sent to a Church. If a writer chose to think of a Church under the figure of a Mother with her Children, there is no reason why he should not use the terminology appropriate to a literal mother.

An objection, however, to taking *κυρία* in 2 John as an instance of the idiomatic Epistolary use, arises from the position of *κυρία*, which ought, in order to make the

¹ Prof. Rendel Harris in EXPOSITOR article.

parallel with the instances quoted above complete, to precede and not to follow ἐκλεκτῇ. This constitutes a rather serious difficulty, as such an Epistolary formula as that with which we are concerned would tend to become stereotyped.

On the whole, therefore, it seems better to regard κυρία in 2 John as a title of honour and respect added in apposition to ἐκλεκτῇ. That a woman is being addressed is shown by the gender of ἐκλεκτῇ, which can by itself signify "To an elect woman," while κυρία indicates that the person addressed is regarded with respect.

The use of κύριος and κυρία as titles of respect may be illustrated both from non-Christian and from Christian sources. Reference to the Corpus Inscr. Graecarum shows that ὁ κύριος was one of the titles applied to certain of the gods, and that in like manner ἡ κυρία was one of the titles applied along with other titles to certain goddesses.¹ There is, further, an instance in a Macedonian epitaph (quoted in Lightfoot's *Philippians*, p. 55, note), which runs :—Εὐτύχης Στρατονίκη τῇ συμβίῳ καὶ κυρία μνείας χάριν. This inscription is quoted by Lightfoot as an evidence of the "deferential language used by the husband speaking of the wife," and is by him connected with the prominence of women in Macedonia, which on other grounds seems probable.

For a similar use of κύριος in Christian writings, we may refer again to the letters of Alexander and Africanus. Thus Africanus, towards the close of the letter already quoted, writes, τοὺς κυρίους μου πάντας προσαγόρευε (*Rel. Sacr.* p. 228).

And Alexander, in a letter to Origen, of which a fragment remains, uses the word several times in speaking of those who had in former days befriended him : πατέρας γὰρ ἴσμεν τοὺς μακαρίους τοὺς προοδεύσαντας, πρὸς οὓς μετολίγον

¹ To ten gods (once to Kronos, 10 times to Hermes, etc.). To five goddesses (3 times to Artemis, 32 times to Isis, etc.). (C.I.G. index iii.)

ἐσόμεθα. Πάνταινόν τὸν μακάριον ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ κύριον· καὶ τὸν ἱερον Κλήμεντα, κύριόν μου γενόμενον καὶ ὠφελήσαντα με καὶ εἴ τις ἕτερος τοιοῦτος. He also applies it to Origen himself, for the quotation ends: δι' ὧν σε ἐγνώρισα τὸν κατὰ πάντα ἄριστον καὶ κύριόν μου καὶ ἀδελφὸν (*Rel. Sacr.* pp. 166, 167).

Of the instances quoted that which gives the closest parallel is the Macedonian inscription, in which συμβίω answers to ἐκλεκτῇ and κυρία to κυρία, the distinctive title in each preceding the more general title.

The Personification of a Community—The Old Testament.

It is sometimes urged as an argument in favour of a literal hypothesis that it has the advantage of simplicity, whereas the figurative hypothesis is unnatural and fanciful. To this it must be answered that on the assumption that the writer was a Jew the personification of a Christian Community as a woman would present no difficulty. Even a slight acquaintance with the Prophetic writings of the Old Testament would render him familiar with this idea.

For in fact the personification of a Community is one of the most frequently recurring phenomena of Hebrew prophetic writing from the time of Amos onwards.¹

We may distinguish two groups of passages:—

(1) In the first group the citizens are regarded collectively as the daughter of the City. Thus in Zephaniah iii. 14, "Sing, O daughter of Zion: shout, O Israel: be glad and rejoice with all thy heart, O daughter of Jerusalem."

Zechariah ii. 7: "Deliver thyself, O Zion that dwellest with the daughter of Babylon"; and in verse 10, "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion." Again in ix. 9, "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion, shout, O daughter of Jerusalem."

¹ See Kirkpatrick's *Amos* (*Camb. Bible*, p. 176)—Driver's *Isaiah, His Life and Times*, p. 183.

Micah iv. 8: "And thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion. . . . the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem." Amos v. 2: "The virgin of Israel is fallen; she shall no more rise." Jeremiah xiv. 17: "The virgin daughter of my people is broken"; xlv. 11, "Go up into Gilead and take balm, O virgin, the daughter of Egypt"; li. 33, "The daughter of Babylon is like a threshingfloor." Lamentations iv. 21: "Rejoice and be glad, O daughter of Edom (cf. verse 22). Isaiah xxxvii. 22: "The virgin, the daughter of Zion, hath despised thee . . . the daughter of Zion hath shaken her head at thee"; xlvii. 1, "Come down, O virgin daughter of Babylon . . . there is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldaeans." Cf. also Lamentations i. and ii. etc., etc.

We may add two passages from the Psalms, viz., ix. 14, "The daughter of Zion," and xlv. 12, "The daughter of Tyre."

(2) In the second group the city is personified as a mother with her children. See for instances the following passages:—Isaiah xlix. 21: "Who hath begotten me these, seeing I have lost my children?" li. 18, "There is none to guide her among all the sons whom she hath brought forth"; liv. throughout especially verses 1, 6, 11, 13; lx. 1–5 ("Thy sons shall come from far and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side," verse 4). xlvii. 8, 9—of Babylon—"Therefore hear now this, thou . . . that sayest in thine heart, I shall not sit as a widow, neither shall I know the loss of children. But these two things shall come to thee in a moment, the loss of children and widowhood."

To these passages may be added the following from Psalm cxxxvii. 8, 9: "O daughter of Babylon . . . happy shall he be that . . . taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones."

From such passages as these it is clear that the personification of a community was "habitual with the prophets," and there is no reason to suppose that the writer of 2 John was oblivious of this.

The appearance of the figure in Baruch and 2 Esdras has an even more direct bearing on the question of what would have been 'natural.' In both these books Jerusalem is personified as a mother with her children; thus in 2 Esdras ii. 2, "the mother that bear them saith unto them, Go your way, ye children, for I am a widow and forsaken"; verse 15, "Mother, embrace thy children and bring them up with gladness . . . for I have chosen thee, saith the Lord." Compare Baruch iv. v., where the personification, as in 2 Esdras ii., is maintained throughout.

The adoption of the figure by these later writers would tend to familiarize the later Jews with the idea of the city being regarded as a person.

*Internal Evidence of 2 John points to a Community
being addressed.*

Turning to the Second Epistle of St. John we observe that it exhibits certain phenomena which can only be explained on the supposition that a community is being addressed. (1) We observe that in the main part of the epistle, i.e., from verses 5 to 12, the writer uses the *plural*. Thus in verse 5 *νῦν ἐρωτῶ σε, κυρία, οὐχ ὡς ἐντολήν γραφῶν σοι καινὴν, ἀλλὰ ἣν εἶχομεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους*. Here the force of *ἀγαπῶμεν* is made evident from the words which follow :—*καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη. ἵνα περιπατῶμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. αὕτη ἡ ἐντολή ἐστι, καθὼς ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ περιπατήτε*. The use of the second person plural (*ἠκούσατε, περιπατήτε*) shows that in writing *ἀγαπῶμεν* the writer is urging not that there should be mutual love between himself and her

whom he addresses, but that there should be mutual love on the part of his readers among themselves ; i.e., he is *identifying himself with his readers*. We have a parallel in the First Epistle : αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγγελία ἣν ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους (1 John iii. 11). So too in 1 John iii. 14, the writer uses the first person, though in verse 13 he had used the second person. The use of the plural in 2 John must therefore be regarded as beginning with the word ἀγαπῶμεν in verse 5. From this point it is used consistently down to the end of verse 12, i.e., to the end of the main part of the Epistle. (See, e.g., in verse 8, βλέπετε. ἀπολέσητε, ἀπολάβητε ; also ὑμᾶς, λαμβάνετε and λέγετε in verse 10, ὑμῖν and ὑμῶν in verse 12).

When, however, we come in verse 13 to the closing salutation we find that there is a sudden change to the *singular* (ἀσπάζεται σε. . .). (2) Further, it is noticeable that in verse 13 no salutation is sent from the elect sister herself, but *only from her children*.

Now these phenomena require explanation. On the literal hypothesis this explanation is very hard to give. On the figurative hypothesis all difficulty disappears. In the main part of the Epistle the figure is dropped, the members of the Church being addressed directly. The form which is given to the closing words is due to literary considerations and the figurative mode of expression is resumed. When the writer sends the greeting "the children of the elect sister salute thee," he is not excluding either the children from receiving the salutation in the one case nor the mother from sending it in the other. The variety of expression is simply a matter of literary style. We may refer in illustration to Baruch iv. 32, δέλαια ἡ δεξαμένη τοὺς υἱούς σου, where Babylon is figured as a woman who receives *the children* of another woman (i.e. Jerusalem). The following words, also from Baruch iv., show clearly that a community could be ad-

dressed alternately as a mother or as children:—τέκνα μακροθυμήσατε τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπελθοῦσαν ὑμῖν ὀργήν, κατεδίωξέ σε ὁ ἐχθρὸς, καὶ ὄψει αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀπώλειαν ἐν τάχει, καὶ ἐπὶ τραχήλους αὐτῶν ἐπιβήσῃ (Baruch iv. 25).

Finally it may be regarded as agreeing well with the figurative hypothesis that in verse 4 of 2 John we have the writer saying, ἐχάριην λίαν ὅτι εὗρηκα ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου περιπατοῦντας ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. It may be justly inferred from the phrase ἐκ τῶν τέκνων that the number of the children was considerable. Now it is of course quite conceivable that there should have been a large family of sons and daughters some of whom had proved faithful while others had apostatized. On the other hand, the form of expression does undoubtedly accord well with the idea of a Community figured as a family.

The internal evidence of the Epistle thus supports the hypothesis that St. John is here personifying communities.

ἐκλεκτῇ and ἐκλεκτῆς.

The use of the term ἐκλεκτῇ in verse 1 (cf. too ἐκλεκτῆς in verse 13) must next be investigated.

As used in the *Old Testament* Israel is specially thought of as a chosen nation. Thus in Jeremiah xxxiii. 24, "The two families whom the Lord hath *chosen*." So Ezekiel writes (xx. 5):—Thus saith the Lord God, "In the day that I *chose* Israel . . ."

In Deutero-Isaiah we meet with the idea frequently. See e.g. xli. 8: "But thou Israel, my servant Jacob, whom I have *chosen*." Isaiah xliii. 20: ". . . to give drink to my people, my *chosen*." The reason for the recurrence of this idea in this prophet is that he wished by insisting on the fact that Israel was a chosen people to bring fresh hope and courage to the desponding nation. "It is," writes Prof. A. B. Davidson, "part of the comfort which he is charged to address to the people. Israel . . ."

was dispersed among all peoples, itself no more a people, etc." (*Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 171).

In the *New Testament* the term "Elect" is applied to Christians. Thus St. Paul writing to the Colossians says, ἐνδύσασθε οὖν ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ (Col. iii. 12). The putting on of a heart of compassion, etc., is urged upon the Colossians on the ground that they are the elect of God, consecrated to Him and the objects of His love. Here the fact that the Colossians are "chosen" is made the ground of an appeal to cultivate the graces of the Christian character. All three terms ἐκλεκτοὶ, ἅγιοι and ἡγαπημένοι have been transferred from the Old Covenant to the New.¹

The epithet "Elect" is also used by St. Peter in chap. i. 1, being applied to the Christians of the five provinces to whom he writes. Here the motive appears to be the same as that which actuated the writer of Deutero-Isaiah. Those addressed were, as the words παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς show, regarded as scattered among the nations. When St. Peter addresses them as "elect" he puts before them the same comfort as that with which the prophet of the old covenant sought to cheer the literal Israel.

In 1 Peter v. 13 we meet with the word συνεκλεκτή. The fact that this word occurs in the closing salutation, and that ἐκλεκτοῖς has been used in the opening salutation, suggests that the two words are to be connected, and we conclude that in συνεκλεκτή as well as in ἐκλεκτοῖς there is a conscious reference to the terminology of the Old Covenant.

There is thus a strong probability that in the ἐκλεκτῇ and ἐκλεκτῆς of 2 John we have examples of terminology transferred and adapted from the Old Testament. And if this be so, we have additional support for the view that the writer was adapting the Old Testament figure of a mother and her children to describe a Christian Community.

¹ Lightfoot, *Commentary on Colossians*, p. 219.

The Meaning of ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή.

The importance of the expression in 1 Peter v. 13, as bearing upon the present discussion, is obvious. Not only does it, as in 2 John, form part of a salutation; but it contains the very epithet ("elect") which is in question. If, therefore, we can throw any light on the meaning of the words in 1 Peter, it will be of material service to us in the solution of our problem.

Two preliminary points are important to note. *First*, it is clear that in a letter intended for circulation over a wide area particular care would be felt to be necessary in drawing up the opening address and the closing salutation.¹ *Secondly*, internal evidence justifies the conclusion that St. Peter in writing this Epistle had specially in mind the writings of the prophets. There are quotations from eight chapters of Isaiah—also quotations from Hosea, Jeremiah and Daniel.²

If with these considerations before us we recall what has already been shown, viz., that the Epistle is addressed to men who are styled "elect," "sojourners" and "of dispersion," and that the *συν* of *συνεκλεκτή* must be taken as referring to *ἐκλεκτοῖς*, we may not unreasonably surmise that in sending a greeting from "her who is in Babylon, elect together with them," St. Peter is consciously adopting the prophetic figure of speech according to which Israel is regarded as a woman taken into captivity into Babylon. Micah iv. 10 may be specially compared, where the prophet writes, "Be in pain . . . O daughter of Sion, like a woman in travail, for now shalt thou go forth out of the city, and thou shalt dwell in the field, and thou shalt go even to Babylon." Cf. also Isaiah lii. 2:

¹ Cf. Deissman on the literary character of the Epistle considered as a consequence of a wide circulation (*Bible Studies*, p. 51).

² Cf. Westcott and Hort, Greek Test. (small ed. p. 607).

“Loose thyself, O captive daughter of Zion.” Cf. also Baruch iv. 32.

The adoption of the prophetic figure of a captive woman could not fail to be understood when read in connection with the *διασπορᾶς* of i. 1. And if, as is probable on other grounds, St. Peter was writing from the capital of the empire, there would be a peculiar fitness in the reference to Babylon. At the same time the reference to Babylon would equally well suit any important city, and cannot be regarded as deciding the question that the Epistle was sent from Rome. Presumably the readers of the Epistle would know where St. Peter was at the time of writing, and would not require to be told. The expression is rather literary than literal. The objection that the personification of a Community would require the possession of a more vivid imagination than St. Peter had proceeds on a false assumption. The use of such a figure would on this hypothesis be the result not so much of the imagination as of familiarity with the prophetic modes of speech.

If then our interpretation of 1 Peter v. 13 be correct, the case for the figurative explanation of *ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ* in 2 John acquires additional strength. For it would then be possible to say that in personifying a Church, St. John was not striking out (so to say) an entirely new line, but was rather accommodating himself to a way of regarding a community which was peculiarly Jewish.

Summary.

To sum up the foregoing considerations (1) we started with the purely linguistic question of the meaning of *κυρία*, and found that there were grounds for regarding it as a title of respect placed in apposition to *ἐκλεκτῇ*. (2) We considered the objection that the figurative hypothesis is unnatural, and showed that when confronted

with the usage of the Prophets of the Old Testament this objection could not stand.

(3) We proceeded to a minute examination of the Epistle which we found to exhibit certain phenomena which were most simply explained by the assumption that the writer was dealing with communities.

(4) The associations of the term "elect" were discussed, and it was seen that these were those of the Old Testament—a fact which seemed to justify the inference drawn from the similarities between 2 John and the Old Testament Prophets.

Finally (5) the meaning of the ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή of 1 Peter v. 13 was subjected to an independent investigation with the result that we were led to the position that St. Peter is here personifying a community. It was accordingly submitted that we have a valuable corroboration of the figurative interpretation of the ἐκλεκτή of 2 John 1.

Conclusion.

From these considerations we arrive at the conclusion that on the whole the evidence is in favour of our regarding the Second Epistle of St. John as addressed not to an individual Christian matron, but to a Christian Church, personified—after the prophetic manner—as a Mother with her Children.

H. J. GIBBINS.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE OF JESUS."

XIII. THE CAUSES OF OFFENCE.

(1) THE saying of the Fourth Evangelist, "He came unto His own home, and His own people received Him not" (John i. 11) expresses the tragedy and the mystery of the Advent of the Son of God among the chosen people of God. Although "God sent forth His Son when the fulness of

the time came" (Gal. iv. 4), yet in the thought and life of His age the Son of Man was a stranger and an out-cast. Mentally, morally, spiritually, as well as physically, in His own age, among His own people, He had nowhere to lay His head (Matthew viii. 20). The time and the place of the Incarnation were appointed by the divine wisdom and counsel, and yet at first how unadapted both seem. We need to remind ourselves that God in every age fulfils His purpose by "a remnant according to the election of grace" (Rom. xi. 5), "the holy seed which is the stock" of God's people (Isa. vi. 13). There were those among the Jewish people who were "looking for the consolation of Israel" (Luke ii. 25); and there were some who received the Word, by believing on His name (John i. 12).

(2) The relation of Jesus to His own age and people presents the same problem as that of every man who is wiser and better than his contemporaries, only in a degree so much higher as Jesus' wisdom and goodness transcend all human talent and excellence. The penalty of greatness, especially of moral and religious genius, is loneliness, misunderstanding, distrust, hate, antagonism, persecution. He who recognizes that it is his vocation to transform the world is often compelled by his conscience not to conform to its moral standards and religious ordinances. This involves an inward struggle prior to the outward battle. A man must master his own affection for, and attachment to, the accepted principles and practices of his age and people before he can attempt to overcome the traditions and conventions of others. A genuine reformer is not a rash innovator, who is devoted to the new because he has no reverence for the old; but his surrender of ancient loyalties is to him an inward crucifixion.

(3) In the experience of Jesus this pain must have been more intense, and this struggle more severe, because the precepts He corrected, and the customs He disregarded,

came to Him with the most sacred sanctions, for He not only set aside the traditions of the scribes, and the conventions of the Pharisees, but He laid down principles that came in conflict with the provisions of the law which He recognized as of God. If, in regard to the Sabbath, He opposed Himself directly only to the Sabbatarianism of contemporary Judaism, yet in the principle to which he appealed, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; so that the Son of Man is lord even of the Sabbath" (Mark ii. 27-28), He assuredly gave to the observance of the day a sanction, not legal in character, and quite independent of the law. The conflict between His own teaching and the requirements of the law in regard to divorce, Jesus was fully aware of, and frankly acknowledged, offering a justification which could be applied to other provisions of the law besides that in dispute. If "Moses wrote this commandment for the hardness of the heart" of the people (Mark x. 5), an adaptation to human imperfection is admitted in the law, which weakens its permanent authority, and lessens its universal validity. The disciples discerned that in regard to ceremonial pollution the teaching of their Master abrogated distinctive requirements of the law, if we may take the comment in Mark, "This He said, making all meats clean" (vii. 19) as reporting what the disciples at the time understood to be His meaning. In setting aside altogether the rule of retaliation, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" (Matt. v. 38 cited from Exodus xxi. 24, Leviticus xxiv. 10), and the limitation of love to a neighbour (Matt. v. 43, the first part of which is cited from Leviticus xix. 18, in which "neighbour" is defined by the phrase "the children of thy people," while the second part, although not a literal citation, is warranted by the command regarding the Ammonite or the Moabite in Deuteronomy xxiii. 6, "Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all

thy days for ever"), Jesus was changing not an insignificant precept, but a prominent, if not dominant, principle of the law. Those who endeavour to show that Jesus criticized and condemned only the obscuration and the perversion of the law by His contemporaries are enlisted in a forlorn hope. The evidence is too abundant and conclusive, that Jesus by His own ideal of morality and religion was compelled to deny the permanent authority and universal validity of important provisions of the law. It is certain that Paul in his struggle for the liberty of the Gentiles had the mind of Christ. In what outer conflicts this attitude of Jesus to the law involved Him in His ministry we shall afterwards consider, but meanwhile emphasis may be laid on the inward strain that this opposition of the new ideal to the old law must have involved for Jesus Himself.

(4) We are warranted in affirming that Jesus was anxious that his attitude to the law should not be misunderstood. In the *Sermon on the Mount* He seeks to show that He has come not to destroy, but to fulfil, as He recognizes the claim of the law for reverence and obedience until so fulfilled. He warns the disciples against the innovation, which is destruction, and not fulfilment. He requires in His disciples a righteousness, in this fulfilment of the law, exceeding the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, who believed themselves to be pre-eminently the exponents, theoretically and practically, of [the law (Matt. v. 17-20). When we look at the instances He gives of His fulfilment of the law, we at once discover that it is not outward observance of the provisions of the law He requires, but inward appreciation of the principles of the law. Some of the provisions, as we have seen, He sets aside altogether; for legal prescriptions He substitutes ethical and spiritual principles. His fulfilment is as little perpetuation as it is destruction of the law. In His desire to conciliate and not to offend, Jesus, as far

as His conscience allowed, conformed to current usages and recognized institutions. A request to interfere in a quarrel about property was met by not only a refusal, but a warning against covetousness (Luke xii. 13-15). The duty of paying taxes to Cæsar was recognized on the ground that, as the Roman Empire conferred benefits, so it could impose obligations, on its subjects (Matt. xxii. 15-22). Although He cleansed the leper, He would not supplant the priest in his office to declare him clean (Luke v. 14). When He told Peter to pay the temple tax, He was careful to explain that what He did was done to avoid offence (Matt. xvii. 27). More surprising still, He acknowledged that the scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses' seat, and bade the disciples obey their precepts, but not follow their practices (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3). These instances of conformity deserve attention, as they throw into bolder relief the cases in which, in spite of the offence He gave, He refused to conform.

(5) The Jewish people was not only the people of the Mosaic law, but also of the Messianic hope. Jesus found Himself out of agreement not only with the popular expectations, but even with the prophetic predictions regarding the Messiah. When, as is often done, the personal ideal of Jesus is opposed to the popular expectations, it is often forgotten that the latter could appeal against the former to the prophetic predictions. Jesus fulfilled the prophets in the same sense as He fulfilled the law, not by any literal coincidence, but by a moral and religious development. He accepted in prophecy what was in accord with His own conscience of His vocation; He rejected whatever fell short of His ideal. The Servant of Jehovah, who suffers that He may save, is an anticipation of the *Son of Man* Jesus willed to be; as the *Son of David*, delivering Israel from a foreign yoke, and ruling in righteousness in Jerusalem, is not. He did not Himself use the title *Son of David*, and seems not to have desired its use by others. When two blind men

appealed to Him as Son of David, He gave no heed, and granted their request only when they had followed Him into a house, enjoining absolute secrecy upon them (Matt. ix. 27). The Syrophenician mother's appeal in the same terms was met with silence (Matt. xv. 22, 23). His argument with the Pharisees regarding the Sonship of the Messiah (Matt. xxii. 41-45) was evidently intended to assert the inadequacy of this view of the Messiahship. That He accepted the title without any challenge from blind Bartimaeus (Mark x. 47-48) and from the multitude at the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem (Matt. xxi. 9) is explicable by the circumstances. For Him the issue of His ministry was already decided, and the reserve that He had exercised in order that false hopes might not be aroused was no longer necessary. In dealing with the Temptation in the *Fifth* of these Studies it was pointed out that "the prophets had depicted the Messianic age as one of material prosperity, political emancipation, and imperial dominion for God's chosen people. The land is to become a garden; the people are to cast off every yoke; the other nations are to seek incorporation in Israel as the condition of Jehovah's favour." The popular expectations rested on a literal interpretation of the prophetic predictions, although these were often vulgarized, and exaggerated in the common imagination. If there is literal fulfilment of prophecy the people were right, and Jesus was wrong; but, if prophecy is as regards its form necessarily conditioned by the time and place of its utterance, but as regards its moral and spiritual substance essentially realized in that which apparently contradicts, because it really transcends its form, Jesus by His ideal fulfilled, the people in their expectations obscured and distorted, the predictions of the prophets. Nevertheless, it cannot have been without inward struggle that Jesus penetrated from the form to the substance. His moral insight and His spiritual discernment were not exercised without effort.

(6) So transcendent was the ideal of Jesus that John the Baptist, His forerunner, was offended by Him. John's question, "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" (Matt. xi. 3), has caused perplexity to many commentators, who assume that the words ascribed to John in the Fourth Gospel, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!" (John i. 29) represent His permanent conception of the Messiah's work. As was indicated in the *Fourth* of these Studies, we can accept these words as genuine only on the assumption, that in conversation with Jesus John had learned His ideal, for a time was by Jesus' influence induced to adopt it, but when that influence was withdrawn, relapsed to that view of the Messiah's work which the Synoptists ascribe to him. According to these records John anticipated that the Messiah would come in judgment, for which the nation seemed to him ripe (Matt. iii. 11-12; Luke iii. 16-17). He called to instant repentance, as an escape from imminent doom (Matt. iii. 10; Luke iii. 9). Jesus Himself indicates a great distance between John's prophecy of judgment, and His own ministry of grace. Although "among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist, yet he that is but little in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he" (Matthew xi. 11). The popular excitement, which John's method of terror aroused appeared to Jesus a method of violence (verse 12), which did not bring gain, but loss to His cause. He had John and his disciples, as well as the multitudes whom John's ministry had influenced in view, when He said, "Blessed is he whosoever shall find none occasion for stumbling in me" (verse 6). To any man with a zeal for righteousness, a belief in justice, a hatred of wrong and sin, who had not discovered the "more excellent way" of love, Jesus' ministry of grace must have appeared a disappointment, and not a fulfilment, of the Messianic hope.

(7) While John laid hold of the moral, judicial aspect of Messianic prophecy, the people laid stress on the secular and the political. Although Jesus exercised a reserve in speech, and a restraint in action, so that there might be no premature disclosure of His Messiahship, before He had transformed, purifying and elevating, the hopes which he claimed to fulfil; yet on several occasions what the people desired of Him, and what He was willing to be and do for them, came in sharp conflict. He distrusted the popular desire for His works of healing, and rebuked the faith that needed signs and wonders (John iv. 48). When His compassion constrained Him to heal, He sought in various ways to escape publicity. This economy in working miracles was an offence to the multitude, but He steadfastly declined to meet the demand of His enemies that He should work a sign from heaven, however gratifying He knew that such a display would be to the people. "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah the prophet" (Matt. xii. 39, xvi. 4). The demand was made by His adversaries not to remove their doubts, but, as refusal was anticipated, to lessen His popularity with the multitudes. That even lower expectations had to be disappointed, His rebuke of the people that had been fed shows: "Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves and were filled" (John vi. 26). The failure of the attempt "to take Him by force, to make Him King" (verse 15) probably produced a reaction of popular feeling against Him. He would not work wonders to gratify their curiosity or to satisfy their necessity at their pleasure; He would not fulfil their worldly, earthly desires; He would not effect the national emancipation that piety and patriotism combined to require of the Messiah—these were the counts of the indictment of the Jewish populace against Jesus. He lost His popularity because He would not lower His ideal.

(8) The disciples undoubtedly shared the popular Messianic expectations. The surname of Simon the *Zealot* (Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13) suggests that the most fanatical party in the Jewish nation was represented in the small company; and it is not probable that Simon on becoming a disciple of Jesus entirely changed his character, abandoned his beliefs and hopes, and that he exercised no influence on the other disciples, to most, if not all, of whom this intense Messianic hope would be quite congenial. The downward career of Judas is not adequately explained by avarice (the vice ascribed to him in John xii. 6). It is much more probable that a baffled aim and a blighted hope were the soil in which the seeds of hate took root, and grew until they bore the fruit of treachery. It is suggestive that the Fourth Gospel connects the first announcement of the betrayal with the time when the popularity of Jesus began to decline after His disappointment of the popular expectations (John vi. 64, 70). If Jesus' quick moral insight detected in Judas the first germs of disloyalty, to the burdens He bore must have been added as no light weight the sense that He was proving an offence to at least one, if not more, of His closest companions. If John vi. 66-70 may be regarded, as is not improbable, as a reminiscence expressed in the distinctively Johannine phraseology of the scene at Caesarea Philippi (Matt. xvi. 13-20), a new significance is given to the Synoptic narrative. The disciples do not by the mouth of Peter confess for the first time their faith in Jesus' Messiahship, but reaffirm their faith, in spite of the disappointment of the expectations with which they had come to Him, and which had been their reason for attaching themselves to Him, because they have accepted the view of the Messiahship which His words and works, with the illumination of the Spirit of God (ver. 17), had presented to their minds. This explanation of the incident does not involve the assumption that Jesus had

given any formal instruction to His disciples regarding His Messiahship or that He had made any explicit disclosures of His position and function ; but that He delayed to make any inquiry regarding, or to seek any confession of their faith, until by His companionship they had been taught and trained to recognize Him as Messiah in the sense He Himself desired. But how imperfect their recognition of His ideal was is shown by the brief interval of time that elapsed between Peter's confession and remonstrance, Jesus' commendation and censure. The Confessor, as soon as Jesus began to announce His approaching passion, became the Tempter ; Peter the Rock became Satan the Adversary. The vehemence of Jesus' rebuke shows the acuteness of the temptation for Him to turn aside from the path of suffering. After this crisis in His relation to His disciples Jesus had to suffer an estrangement of feeling, an antagonism of purpose on their part. The Cross to the very end never ceased to be an offence to them. It is not necessary here to repeat what has been written in the *Eleventh* of these Studies on the efforts Jesus made so to teach and train His disciples that they would be constrained to accept His will to suffer. Their ambition and rivalry (Matt. xviii. 1-3), their exclusiveness (Mark ix. 38-40), their intolerance (Luke ix. 54-56), their mercenariness (Matt. xix. 27-30) show how different their spirit was from His. Perhaps no incident presents this contrast so vividly as the attempt of the sons of Zebedee on the one hand to gain an unfair advantage over the other disciples, and the anger among the company which this effort provoked ; and, on the other hand, the confession by Jesus of His own ideal. "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28). If we are endeavouring to realize in any measure what the "inner life" of Jesus was during this closing period of His ministry, we must try to imagine how lonely

He was, because to His disciples His purpose of self-sacrifice was an offence.

(9) When Jesus began His ministry in Jerusalem, He soon discovered the hostility of the religious rulers and teachers. As has been fully shown in the *Eighth* of these Studies, He condemned the party of the Sadducees, the priestly aristocracy in Jerusalem, as by their worldly policy the destroyers of the religion of which they claimed to be the custodians (John ii. 19). The motives of the part they played in the final tragedy of the Cross will be subsequently discussed. The party of the Pharisees, to which the scribes for the most part belonged, Jesus censured in their representative Nicodemus as spiritually incapable, without a thorough change, of understanding or sharing in the great movement that He had just begun; they without a birth from above could neither see nor enter into the Kingdom of God (iii. 3, 5). While it was only at the end of His ministry that Jesus was again brought into close relations with the Sadducees, throughout the whole course of His ministry His steps were dogged by the Pharisees, who, zealous for their own ascendancy among the people, and jealous of His influence over the multitudes drawn by His preaching and healing, were ever on the watch for any breach of their moral conventions and religious traditions, in order that they might discredit His character, depreciate His reputation, and destroy His authority. The causes of offence that they found in Him may very briefly be noticed. Having refused to ally Himself with their party, He turned to the common people whom as ignorant of the law they held accursed (John vii. 49); He chose as one of His close, constant companions Matthew, who had been engaged in the unpatriotic and impious calling of a tax-gatherer, a tool of the tyranny of Rome so intolerable to every Jew who cared for His God and his country (Mark ii. 14); and He made use of this

connection to come into personal contact with others who were in the same employment and with many men who on account of their laxity in the observance of the law were regarded as sinners (verse 15). By this policy Jesus in the eyes of the Pharisees not only incurred ceremonial pollution Himself, but disregarded and defied what was regarded as one of the most essential provisions of the law, the strict observance of which was regarded as a distinctive evidence of piety. Two instances of Jesus' offence claim special notice; His acceptance of the tribute of gratitude from the sinful woman, which led His host to question His prophetic character (Luke vii. 39); and His choice of Zacchaeus the chief publican as His host in Jericho, which called forth the censure of the crowd (Luke xix. 7). Jesus with absolute confidence justified His policy. It was His unique function "to seek and to save that which was lost" (verse 10); as the Healer sent by God His rightful place was among the sick; He was properly offering His salvation to those who were in common repute held to need it most, not to those who in their own judgment had no need of it (Mark ii. 17); as every sinner was a loss to God, and his recovery brought joy to God, He in saving sinners was pleasing God (Luke xv. 3-10); His attitude of compassion, and not the Pharisees' attitude of contempt for sinners expressed God's heart as Father (verses 11-32); the gracious pardon He offered could in the most sinful evoke so intense an affection as gave a certain assurance of a changed life (vii. 41-50). In these answers Jesus laid down two principles that were in absolute opposition to Pharisaic precept and practice; firstly, God desires the recovery of the most sinful, and they are capable of such recovery; secondly, goodness is not self-protective only, but self-communicative, and such goodness alone resembles God's-Jesus' claim to be Saviour, which in these answers He assumes, was formally challenged by His enemies, when

He assured the paralytic, brought to Him by four friends, of his forgiveness (Mark ii. 1-7). He did not deny that Pharisaic assumption that God alone can forgive; He did not assert that any man can offer this assurance in God's name; but by an outward sign of healing He proved His authority as Messiah so to represent God on earth. This claim was offensive to the Pharisees, not only because He, who on other grounds was so hateful to them, claimed so lofty a right; but also because for their legalistic piety such a ministry of pardon towards sinners, in disregard of the paramount claims of the law, would appear in the highest degree morally dangerous as an encouragement to laxity. He was offering the people another way of approach to God than the way of the law that the scribes had been so careful to hedge. The Pharisees believed that they had a convincing proof of this laxity in the neglect of Jesus' disciples to keep the ordinary fasts (Mark ii. 18-20). His answer by ignoring denied their assumption of the moral obligation and the religious merit of fasting; as a compulsory observance He will not recognize it; as a spontaneous expression of natural emotion He admits its legitimacy. As the emotion natural to His companions is gladness, fasting would for them now be quite out of place. He suggests that a time of separation will come, when fasting may express their feelings. Does not this answer give us a bright glimpse of the spirit of Jesus' ministry, especially of His companionship with the Twelve? More than any other offences did Jesus' disregard of the Sabbath law outrage the conscience of the Pharisees. Against the charge of Sabbath-breaking, He defended His disciples when they had plucked ears of corn as they passed through a field, and Himself repeatedly, when He had wrought a cure. His answers are varied in character. David's example when he eat the shewbread reserved for the priests is appealed to (Mark ii. 25-26) as

showing that ceremonial law may be set aside in order that physical need may be met. The practice of circumcision (John vii. 22), and the observance of sacrifice on the Sabbath in the Temple (Matt. xii. 5), show that there are provisions of the law more sacred, and that consequently the Sabbath law has no absolute authority. That it is intended for man's good, and that it must therefore be subordinated to man's good is explicitly affirmed: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath" (Mark ii. 27). All acts of beneficence are declared legitimate on the Sabbath, as it is to be devoted to doing good and not evil; especially is care of life incumbent (Matt. xii. 10, 12; Mark iii. 4). The kindness shown to animals in providing for their needs, or saving them from danger (Luke xiii. 15, xiv. 5; Matt. xii. 11-12), should much more be shown to men, as theirs is a far greater value. "How much then is a man of more value than a sheep!" The humanity so characteristic of all His words and works, which Jesus here exalts above all legality, was the very antithesis of the Pharisaic attitude. Let men consistently order their lives by such principles, and the doom of legalism is pronounced. Jesus' claim as Son of Man to be Lord of the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 8) must have appeared to those who regarded themselves as the authoritative interpreters of the Law as intolerable presumption; still more His plea that He was working even as His Father worked (John v. 17), although He meant it as a proof of His dependence on, submission to, and communion with God, appeared to them nothing less than the blasphemy of making Himself equal with God.

(10) As Jesus' abrogation of the law of ceremonial defilement in defending His disciples against the charge that they had eaten with unwashed hands (Mark vii. 11-23) has already been referred to, it need not detain us further;

but we may pass on to notice in closing this study that the offence for which Jesus was condemned by the Sanhedrin was not really any one of these offences which we have discussed; although the ostensible charge was blasphemy in claiming to be the Christ the Son of God (Matthew xxvi. 63-66), the real reason for His condemnation is given in the cynical confession of Caiaphas, as reported in the Fourth Gospel (xi. 50): "It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." On the one hand Jesus had challenged the authority of the worldly priesthood even in the Temple (John ii. 13-19); on the other His movement was likely to attract the attention of the Roman Government, and to lead to further measures of repression (John xi. 48). To save their position and power thus threatened, this worldly priesthood exploited Pharisaic bigotry, popular fanaticism, and the weakness of the Roman Governor to sacrifice Jesus as an offence to their secular ambition.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS OF LYCAONIA.

In studying the Christian inscriptions of Lycaonia, one is met by the difficulty of specifying the period to which they belong. Whereas the Phrygian Christian inscriptions are frequently dated exactly by year, month and day, and the dated texts form a fixed and certain series alongside of which the undated can be arranged with an approximation to certainty, not a single Lycaonian inscription has been found dated according to an era, such as was used in Phrygia; the custom of dating by an era was rarely, or not at all, practised in Lycaonia. Except where an Emperor or other known person is mentioned, no Lycaonian inscription can be fixed by external and indubitable evidence;

and among the Christian inscriptions that means of determining the period is, of course, not available. The only useful method is to arrange them in classes, according to the formulæ used, then to place these, as far as possible, in chronological succession, and finally to try to determine the period when the earliest class began and when the others were in use.

A first question that arises in this connexion is whether there is any reason to expect that in Lycaonia Christian inscriptions should begin later than in Phrygia. So far as regards the time when the new religion became so general in the country that such a large number of Christian epitaphs could be openly set up, there is no reason to think that Asian Phrygia was more quickly and early Christianized than the Lycaonian country about Iconium and Laodiceia.¹ On the contrary, Christianity seems, so far as the indications afford ground for judgment, to have penetrated much further to the north, and therefore presumably more rapidly, from Iconium than from the first centre in Asian Phrygia (viz., the Lycus valley, where Colossæ, Laodiceia and Hierapolis were situated). So far as this consideration goes, we should expect Christian inscriptions to be numerous in Lycaonia at an earlier time than in Phrygia. But it is true that ordinary Pagan epigraphy seems to have spread from the west eastwards, and to have been generally practised in Phrygia earlier than in Lycaonia or Galatia or Cappadocia. Epigraphy spread along with the Greek language and education. From this point of view Christian epigraphy may have been affected by the general principle, and perhaps we should date it later in Lycaonia than in Asian Phrygia. But the difference in time cannot have been very

¹ This part of the Byzantine Province Lycaonia was called in the strict nomenclature of the first century Galatic Phrygia; but as explained above, we speak here of Lycaonia in the Byzantine provincial extent, as it was from A.D. 372 onwards.

great, especially as it seems clear that Christianity was an effective agent in spreading the knowledge of Greek and killing the native languages in Anatolia.¹ It seems safe to suppose that Christian epigraphy was not more than fifty years later in Lycaonia than in Asian Phrygia. Now the earliest Christian epitaphs known in Phrygia are fixed about 192 and about 224 A.D., while about 250 the dated inscriptions become numerous.²

On this line of argument we should have to look for the earliest Christian epitaphs in Lycaonia about 240 A.D., and expect that about 300 they should be common; but as 300 lies within the time of the severest persecution, we should rather regard 310–350 as the time when they were frequent. This is exactly the period when the rich Christian epigraphy of Nova Isaura (between Lystra and Derbe) has been placed according to a careful examination and argument.³

As a general rule it is certain that formulæ which approximate in form to, or are identical with, Pagan formulæ were earlier in origin than those which are overtly Christian in character. As has been frequently pointed out, Christian society and social customs were only slowly differentiated from the common everyday society and customs of the time. This then must be taken as a principle to start from, that epitaphs expressed according to a form ordinarily used by the Pagans are to be arranged earlier in chronological order than those which are purely Christian in character; and this principle will, at once, simplify our task greatly.

It will, I think, be found that several formulæ, which probably most scholars were formerly disposed to consider as quite late and purely Byzantine in period—as was

¹ See *Zeitschrift f. vgl. Sprachforschung*, N. F. viii. p. 382 f., and *Oesterr. Jahreshefte*, 1905, *Beiblatt*, introd. to art. on "Later Phrygian Inscriptions."

² *Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. pp. 713, 526.

³ See Miss Ramsay's paper in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 290 f.

the present writer's view at least—had come into use in Lycaonia at least as early as the fourth century; and there is some probability that a considerable part of the earliest Christian symbolism in art originated in that country.

The overwhelming majority of Pagan epitaphs in the central regions of Asia Minor under the Roman Empire follow the form that such and such a person constructed the tomb for himself, or for some other person or persons, or for both himself and others. The construction of the tomb was a religious duty; and the document began by mentioning the performance of this duty. The Christian epitaphs, which are expressed in this form, may be placed first in our classification. Certain individual epitaphs of this class present various other features, which point to an early date, and thus confirm the general principle. The names and the lettering are, as a whole, of an early type; neither of these criteria are sufficiently definite to date, or even fix the order of, the inscriptions, but occasionally they furnish in isolated cases strong and even complete evidence.

The formula "Here lies the slave of God" (ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ), followed by the name of the deceased, belongs to a more developed stage of Christian expression. An early stage of its development can perhaps be traced in a Laodicean inscription—

Athenedorus, house-servant of God, and Aelia Eupatra his wife, while in life (prepared the grave) for themselves.

The term "house-servant of God" (οἰκέτης Θεοῦ) in itself might quite fairly be taken as a mere refinement of the commoner "slave of God," and therefore later in origin; but such an opinion is refuted by the character of this inscription, which is expressed in the earlier class of formula, mentioning first the name of the maker of the

tomb. The names, too, are of an early type, especially the name of the wife Aelia Eupatra; and we may feel fairly confident that the inscription must be as early as the fourth century, perhaps even the end of the third. Looking at the style of letters, and the general impression given by the inscription as a whole, I should be inclined to place it in the third century.

The phrase "Slave of Christ" is, evidently, later than "Slave of God," as being more remote than Pagan forms of expression. The latter might quite conceivably be used by a Pagan, though I cannot quote any case in which it was so used. The only inscription known to me, in which "Slave of Christ" occurs, is marked beyond question by other characteristics as of the developed Byzantine period; the title "Comes" occurs, and the detestable spelling (occurring not in rude village work, but on the tomb of a high officer) shows that the epitaph is likely to be of the seventh century or even later.

It may therefore be concluded that the phrase "house-servant of God" belongs to an early stage in the development of Christian forms of expression, and that it was tried before usage had settled on the phrase "slave of God" and stereotyped this latter phrase. Now the rare phrase "house-servant of God" occurs only (so far as I have observed) in the earlier class of epitaphs, while "slave of God" is unknown to me in that class. The formula "Here lies the slave of God" is a purely Christian form, and therefore later; and the second half of the formula is also later in character, so that the first part, "Here lies," is also likely to be later.¹

In the whole series of the early Lycaonian inscriptions I have observed only one allusion to the New Testament, and that one does not show a very accurate recollection of the words.

¹ Laodiceia No. 16 (*Athen. Mittheil.* 1888, p. 240).

Dikaïos, measurer of corn for distribution, raised the stele to his wife Mouna, after a wedded life of 23 years, [] months, 20 days, and made (the tomb) for himself in his life-time. And the sarcophagus belongs to Him who knocks where the door stands before Him.

The allusion to Revelation iii. 20, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock," seems indubitable; though the Greek shows rather less similarity than the English.¹ It is possible that on the broken ornament of the top a personal name was engraved, and then the first line should be translated "a just measurer of corn." But Dikaïosyne occurs as a woman's name in a neighbouring village, and Dikaïos is sometimes found as a man's name and probably so used here.

The Presbyters mentioned are very numerous. With regard to them we note that in many cases they were married. The number of cases where marriage is proved by mention of wife or children or both is so large, that this was evidently the ordinary custom in the Lycaonian congregations. The unmarried Presbyters were indubitably exceptional. Some of the inscriptions in which they are mentioned may perhaps be as early as the end of the third century: e.g.—

I Aur. Nestor erected this titlos to my sweetest father Callimachus in remembrance.

This is marked as early (1) by the formula; it may be doubted if any inscription in which the maker of the tomb is named in the opening words is later than the middle of the fifth century (perhaps even than the end of the fourth).

(2) By the use of Aurelius as mere *praenomen*: this usage began in 212, and was extremely common in the third century, much less common in the fourth (when

¹ κρούω and ἔστηκα ἐπὶ in Rev. iii. 20, κόπτω and ἐπέστηκεν (sic) in the epitaph; but the latter is composed by an uneducated villager, who made κόπτωνος the gen. of κόπτων, and remembered badly the words of the New Testament.

Flavius began to be used to some extent in the same way), and very rare in the fifth.

(3) By the term *titlos*, frequent in (probably) Pagan inscriptions of the third century or earlier.

"Presbyter of the holy Church of God" (τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας) is an expression that belongs probably to the later fourth or early fifth century. It can hardly have originated later, for in one of Hamilton's inscriptions "the very pious Deacon of the holy Church of God of the Novatians, Patricius," has a grave made for him by his brother Aur. Zotikos; this inscription has several marks of comparatively early character; and the name Novatians is not likely to have been kept by the sect in open use very long.¹ The sect and the name were proscribed about A.D. 420, and that determines the latest possible date for the epitaph. I should regard this epitaph as older than 400.

The most interesting picture of the Lycaonian presbyter's duties is contained in the following epitaph:—

The help of widows, orphans, strangers, and poor, [Nestor?, son of Nestor?], presbyter in charge of the sacred expenditure: in remembrance.

(Garland in relief.)

This remarkable inscription is mutilated, and (besides the personal name) two of the words, viz. "strangers" and "expenditure," are not quite certain. It is possible that "strangers" should be omitted entirely,² and it is possible that "things" or "business" should be read in place of "expenditure."³ But the first point of doubt is

¹ C.I.G. no. 9268.

² The choice is between [καὶ ταλαι]πώρων and [ξένων ταλαι]πώρων: I see no criterion to give certainty; see *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1905, p. 167, f. The former was suggested by Professor A. Souter, and the latter by Professor F. Cumont, independently. I sent copies of the inscription to each of them as soon as I found it. I think the word "strangers" was used, as the duty of hospitality was strenuously insisted on in the early Church. See below.

³ The choice is between [πραγ]μάτων and [ἀνάλω]μάτων: it is probable that the latter is correct. The first was suggested by Professor F. Cumont, and the second is my own.

not really important; and the circumstances seem to support the reading "expenditure" in the second, for the title of the presbyter gives the explanation of the opening words. Nestor (or whatever was the name of the deceased) was the helper of widows, orphans, strangers and poor, because he was the presbyter in charge of the Church expenditure.

In favour of reading "strangers" as well as "poor," an unpublished inscription, found near Dorla (Isaura Nova) in 1905, may be quoted. It contains only the words:—

Koulas to Solon, a stranger, in remembrance.

Moreover, we remember the New Town, the great foundation built by Basil near Caesareia, including almshouse, hospital, and place of entertainment for strangers, where travellers and sick persons might find the comfort that they wanted, doctors, means of conveyance, and escort. The reading "strangers and poor" would therefore suit the facts of Christian Church organization during the fourth century excellently.

With regard to the date of this epitaph, we notice in the first place that it is of the later, not the older type: there is no mention of the maker of the tomb. No date can therefore be thought of earlier than the middle of the fourth century.

But, further, it is hardly safe to place the epitaph much later than about 350. There is nothing of a stereotyped and formulated character. It reads like the free expression of an individual mind, and formulæ were likely to grow out of this expression at a later date. In the same district and about the same time we find an example of the tendency to stereotype this expression as a formula descriptive of any Presbyter: it occurs as part of a long metrical epitaph, "Nestor lies (here), a presbyter, helper of poor widows."¹

¹ The text is badly mutilated: an imperfect copy is given in *Journal of*

I feel in reading this metrical epitaph that the phrase just quoted springs from the same root as the prose epitaph previously quoted. Either they both relate to the same presbyter (in which case the name "Nestor, son of Nestor" ¹ would have to be restored), or the expression, "help of widows, etc.," first devised for the prose epitaph, came to be used for subsequent presbyters (just as we shall find below a form of metrical epitaph, employed for any priest, with the name thrust regardless of metre into the verse). The former supposition is perhaps more probable, for the long metrical epitaph seems to have been specially composed for this particular presbyter Nestor, and to be of much higher rank than most of the metrical epitaphs of this region.

Now in publishing that metrical inscription I argued from the name of the province (as restored) that it had been composed before A.D. 372; and the apostrophe to the passer-by and the whole style of expression suit a comparatively early date. It is not stereotyped Byzantine, but direct and original; and while the text is too incomplete for certainty, the erector of the tomb was probably mentioned. Thus it seems a fair conclusion that both the prose and the metrical epitaph should be dated between A.D. 340 and 372.

These two epitaphs, especially the one in prose, seem to have arisen in the same surroundings of thought and custom, in which the *Apostolic Constitutions*, ii. ch. 35, grew up; but the latter is distinctly expressed in more formed and almost stereotyped phraseology. "Thus will your righteousness surpass [that of the scribes and Pharisees] if you take greater forethought than they for the priests and the

Hellenic Studies, 1905, p. 169. I recopied it in May, 1905.

¹ Νέστωρ ὀνς, a very common form of expression. There is hardly room for the full name of the father in genitive (especially if καὶ παλαι is the correct text in l. 1).

orphans and the widows : as it is written, He hath scattered abroad : he hath given to the poor¹ . . . For thy duty is to give, and the priest's duty to manage, as manager and administrator of the ecclesiastical things."

The term "ecclesiastical" seems to indicate a more advanced state of organization than the word "sacred," which is used in the corresponding part of the epitaph. Moreover the manager (οἰκονόμος) is in the next sentence of the *Constitutions* said to be the bishop, while in the epitaph the presbyter is the administrator. The title manager (οἰκονόμος) is used several times in the Lycaonian inscriptions to indicate apparently a presbyter, not a bishop—one who was charged specially with the duty of managing the money of the church devoted to charitable purposes. Thus it seems to be implied that in each Lycaonian church there was a certain fund, contributed by the congregation (as the *Constitutions* state) and distributed to widows, orphans, and poor (perhaps also to strangers in the form of entertainment) by the Presbyter, or by one of the Presbyters, who was specially entitled Oikonomos.

The long metrical Lycaonian inscription already quoted speaks of the presbyter in another relation in which the *Apostolic Constitutions* would probably mention a bishop. Immediately after "the Presbyter, help of poor widows," the metrical epitaph mentions "the Deacon, excellent subordinate-worker." In the *Constitutions*, ii. 30, is given an elaborate statement of the relation of the deacon to the bishop, exactly on the lines of the relation stated in this epitaph between the deacon and the presbyter : "Let the Bishop be honoured by you in the place of God, and the Deacon as his prophet, for as Christ without the Father does nothing, so neither does the Deacon without the Bishop; and as Son is not without Father, so neither is

¹ τοῖς πένησιν, in the prose epitaph ταλαπύρων is the word.

Deacon without the Bishop; and as Son is subordinate ¹ to Father, so also every Deacon to the Bishop; and as the Son is messenger and prophet of the Father, so also the Deacon is messenger and prophet of the Bishop."

In the *Constitutions*, ii. 19, the name Bishop is roughly used in a still wider generic fashion, to include the entire clergy as distinguished from the laity: "Listen, ye bishops; and listen, ye laymen." In this and in the following chapter 20, it is clear that the generic distinction between guide and guided, shepherd and sheep, is in the writer's mind, and that the clergy, higher or lower, are the shepherd, but only the head and representative of the clergy is named on behalf of the whole order. Where the Bishop is, the rest of the clergy does not act except as ministers of his will and policy; but, as doing so, they share in his honourable position and dignity; and where he is not, the next in order acts for him, and is the father and shepherd of the people.

"Let the laymen honour the shepherd, who is good, love him, fear him as father, as lord, as high priest of God, as teacher of piety . . . In like manner let the Bishop love the laity as his children." One feels that the Lycaonian epitaphs might use the same words about the Presbyter.

Here it seems probable that in the *Constitutions* the relation of Deacon and Bishop is generically the relation of Deacon to the higher order of the ministry, and practically includes the relation of Deacon to Presbyter. I do not mean that Bishop and Presbyter were the same thing; but that the term Bishop could still be used, and was sometimes used, as a generic term to include Presbyters and Bishops.

¹ ὑπάρχους, whereas my second copy of the metrical epitaph has ὑπουργός[s]; but in this almost obliterated ending of a line, it would be easy to mistake ΤΗΟΧΡΕΟ for ΥΠΟΥΡΓΟ, where every faint trace has to be divined and read by faith rather than by sight. Still, I think my copy is to be accepted.

In the epitaphs, on the other hand, the term *Presbyter* is used in situations where the *Constitutions* would probably speak of a Bishop. The Lycaonian *Presbyter* managed the church finances and charitable funds, with the Deacon as his subordinate in administration: in the *Constitutions* the Bishop stands in precisely that same relation to Church and Deacon. Thus the epitaphs stand on the same stage of thought, which made it possible to use the term co-presbyters of several officials, even if one or all of them were Bishops.

The term "Bishop" is also used in some early Lycaonian inscriptions, probably already in the third century; and in one case, probably about the middle of the third century, a deceased bishop is called "the Makarios Papas,"¹ a term known to have been employed elsewhere in that period. Again—

Makeros and Oas and Anolis the sister did honour to the Bishop Mammias friend to all men.²

The final epithet, "friend to all," is simply an epitome of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, ii. 20. This is of the older class of epitaphs.

Somewhat later, doubtless of the fourth century, is the following:—

The very pure and sweet-voiced and with-all-virtue-adorned Sisamoas Bishop.³

The epithets here differ from, yet have a distinct analogy to, those used of the Bishop by Basil of Cæsareia about 370: the epithets are there quite conventional and stereotyped, ὁ θεοφιλέστατος ἐπίσκοπος, addressed as "your piety," "your perfection," "your God-fearing-ness," "your divine and most perfect consideration," "your compre-

¹ See EXPOSITOR, 1905, March, p. 214.

² Miss Ramsay in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 269.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

hension":¹ these have all come to be used as polite designations and forms of address.

The two inscriptions describing the duties of the Presbyter present to us the free and unstereotyped stage of expression, out of which grew the forms used in Basil's time; and therefore we can hardly date them later than A.D. 350.

Another example of an early Bishop is:

Apas son of Kouanzapheês erected to his brother Indakos, Bishop, just, beloved, in his own life-time and for himself, in remembrance.

(Symbol.) (Leaf.) (Garland.) (Leaf.) (Symbol.)²

This unpublished inscription, found in 1905 between Nea Isaura, Derbe, and Barata, is of the early class.

The distinction between clergy and laity as two separate orders is clearly marked in the Lycaonian inscriptions, hardly indeed in the earliest class, but certainly in those which may on our view be placed soon after the middle of the fourth century. The use of the term *hiereus* to designate a Bishop or Presbyter probably marks the recognition of this distinction. Those who spoke of a *hiereus* naturally recognized the priest as belonging to a different order from the people; and the correlative term *laos*, to indicate the laity, must have come into use at the same time. The Lycaonian inscriptions in which either term occurs generally seem to be as late as the fifth century, but some are probably of the second half of the fourth. The fact that *hiereus* is so much rarer in these inscriptions than Presbyter forms an argument that we have been right in placing a large number of the epitaphs earlier than A.D. 350.

Two epitaphs at the ancient village beside Zazadin-Khan, twelve miles north-east from Iconium, show the same metrical form applied to two *hiereis* or priests of the village.

¹ Basil, Epist. 181 (dated 374 A.D.), ἡ εὐλάβεια σου frequent, ἡ σὴ τελειότης 172, ἡ θεοσέβεια σου 167, ἡ ἐνθεος καὶ τελειοτάτη φρόνησις σου 141, ἡ σύνεσις σου 165. A presbyter, on the other hand, is simply "your perfect consideration," ἡ τέλεια φρόνησις σου, or "honoured head," τιμία κεφαλὴ, 156.

² The "symbols" in this line were defaced: they were enclosed within circles, and were probably either crosses or six-leaved rosettes.

Here lies a man, priest of great God, who on account of gentleness gained heavenly glory, snatched hastily from Church and congregation, having the name Apollinarius [in the other case, Gregory], great glory of the congregation.¹

The formula, "here lies," is of later type than the epitaphs in which the maker of the tomb is mentioned; it is a mere translation of the Latin *hic jacet*, and marks the spread of Roman custom in the Greek-speaking districts of the East. Probably no example of it can be dated earlier than the latter half of the fourth century.

One of the two epitaphs, that of Gregory, has two additional lines, worse in syntax and expression than the four stereotyped verses, and hardly intelligible: perhaps

"A man who was a care to God through joyousness; E[. . .]s erected the stele and thus inscribed on the tomb."²

Here the older form of epitaph, mentioning the maker of the tomb, makes itself felt at the end, implying that that class was not yet forgotten and wholly out of date. In accordance with the principles on which we are working, it would be impossible to place this inscription later than about 400 A.D. Now the formula of the first four lines was not composed for Gregory, but taken from an already stereotyped epitaph suitable for any priest, and when the composer of Gregory's epitaph tried to add something distinctive in the last two lines he sank to a much lower level and became almost unintelligible. The metrical formula, therefore, was a fourth century composition, perhaps not much later than 350, like the long metrical epitaph quoted above with several others in the same region.³ That long metrical

¹ Published by my travelling companion, Rev. H. S. Cronin, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1902, p. 361 f.

² Rev. H. S. Cronin in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1902, p. 362, No. 126; but I should prefer now to restore a proper name at the beginning of the fifth hexameter, E[. . .]s. The form so-and-so ἀνέστησεν the deceased is common in Lycania.

³ For example, the first of the New-Isauran inscriptions published by Miss Ramsay in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 262; also No. 69, *ibid.*, 1905, p. 176.

epitaph probably contains the verb *ἱερεύειν* in l. 2, which would presuppose the use of the noun *hiereus*. Thus we can push back the popular use of the term *hiereus* in Lycaonia as far at least as about 350 A.D.

There is, of course, no difficulty in supposing that the distinction between priest and laity (*ἱερεύς* and *λαός*) was even older than this: the words are taken from the language of the Septuagint. Already in 218 an expression (quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 19, 18) is found, where the congregation (*λαός*) is set over against the bishop: the distinction is here latent though not explicit. At the same time it is certain that priests even late in the fourth century ordinarily lived by practising some trade, as Basil, *Ep.* 198, says, "the majority of them ply sedentary crafts, whereby they get their daily bread."

An inscription, which must cause some hesitation is—

Papas and Gaius, sons of Titus Lorentius, to their father
hiereus and Mania their mother hierissa in remembrance.¹

I published this at first as an ordinary Pagan inscription; but, since subsequently published epitaphs have shown that *hiereus* and *archiereus* came into ordinary use in Lycaonian epigraphy as technical Christian terms, it seems more probable that here we have a Christian epitaph involving the distinction between clergy and laity. The bare words *hiereus* and *hierissa* seem not to be in keeping with a Pagan epitaph. In Pagan usage a *hiereus* belonged to the worship of one deity, and as a rule either the name of the god to whom the *hiereus* belonged was expressed or the context or situation left no doubt as to what deity and cult the *hiereus* was attached. At one of the great sanctuaries (Hiera) of Anatolia, where a single supreme priest stood at the head of the college of priests as representative of the god, it would be natural and was quite common to state a date "in the time when Noumenios was priest" without men-

¹ Laodiceia, No. 7 (*Athen. Mittheil.*, 1888, p. 237).

tioning in any part of the document the deity or the cult ; but the situation and facts in that case left no doubt, for dating was practised only according to the one supreme priest. Similarly, *archiereus* is often used absolutely, because it was a perfectly distinctive term, inasmuch as there was only one *archiereus* in the city or district. But the use of the bare terms *hiereus* and *hierissa* in an ordinary Pagan epitaph in a city where there must have been many priests and *hierissa* seems so contrary to custom and difficult of understanding that it cannot be admitted with our present knowledge. We conclude that probably Titus Lorentius (popular pronunciation of Laurentius) and Mania were priest and priestess, perhaps a Bishop and his wife, in Laodiceia not later than about 360 A.D.

It would certainly be impossible to take *hierissa* in that epitaph as indicating a special official position in the Church. If the inscription is Christian, *hierissa* can only mean "wife of a priest." This would seem, perhaps, a unique phenomenon in Christian usage ; and it could only be explained as belonging to a quite early stage, when terminology was not properly settled and understood, and when the Pagan custom, that man and wife should hold the offices of high-priest and high-priestess,¹ was still not forgotten. We have seen that the epitaph is of the older class. Our interpretation is defended by an inscription of Isaura Nova.²

Doxa Oikonomissa the revered (σεμνή).

In this case also it is improbable that *oikonomissa* indicated a special official position in the Church. It may perhaps be interpreted "wife of an *oikonomos*."³

¹ See *Classical Review*, Nov. 1905, p. 417.

² *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 283, No. 24.

³ *Oikonomos* is used as feminine (like *Diakonos* for *Diakonissa*) in the long metrical epitaph of Nestor the Presbyter and *Oikonomos*, quoted above. The wife of Nestor is there styled *Oikonomos*, like her husband. I hope to return to this metrical epitaph (which at present offers many unsolved difficulties) in a subsequent article. The argument mentioned above as to date, from the name of the Province, is affected by

The term *oikonomos*, used evidently in the sense above defined, as Presbyter in charge of the charitable funds of the Church, occurs in another inscription of Isaura Nova.¹

Claudia did honour to Aur. Thal-ain her husband, honourable *oikonomos*, in remembrance.

This inscription is one of a class which belongs to the period 260–340, as I have argued on various grounds (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 290 f.).

Similarly, Presbyterissa would perhaps have to be taken as the wife of a Presbyter; but its occurrence is uncertain. The index of the *Corpus* of Greek inscriptions quotes it from No. 8624; but it depends there on a restoration, which is quite incorrect and unjustified by the copy. The Lexicon of Stephanus quotes it once, but the place does not bear on our purpose. If the inscription, which name many Presbyters and their wives, never use the term Presbyterissa, this would go far to show that a Presbyter's wife did not share his title.

These examples suggest the question whether Diakonissa in the inscriptions of Lycaonia may not mean simply the wife of a Diakonos. The examples are inconclusive. In one case two sons raise the tomb to their mother Nonna, Diakonissa.² Another would probably be a test case, but the language is so ungrammatical as to be practically unintelligible. It is the epitaph of two persons, styled the excellent (and) blessed (dead), Flavius Alexander and Amia Diakonissa, belonging probably to the latter part of the fourth century, or the early fifth.³ Here Alexander and Amia are certainly husband and wife. Alexander has no one uncertainty: the restoration should perhaps be [ἡμετέρ]ης and not [Πεσίδικ]ῆς. But other characteristics point to the same period, 340–372, or even earlier. My chief desire, at present, is to avoid assigning too early a date to the inscriptions; and it may ultimately be proved that they ought to be placed a little earlier than I have ventured to do.

¹ *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1905, p. 172, No. 46.

² Anderson in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1899, p. 130, No. 155.

³ Anderson, *ibid.* 1898, p. 126, No. 89.

official title; but the doubt remains whether the omission is due merely to helplessness and inadvertence, the uneducated composer having a vague idea that the title *Diakonissa* might imply also that the husband had corresponding rank. If that could be assumed, the case would be conclusive that the official title of the husband was communicated to the wife. But it is more probable that Alexander held no office, and *Amia* was deaconess in her own right.

Less uncertainty attaches to another case, in which a deaconess named *Basilissa* erected the tomb of her father-in-law *Quintos*, chief man of the village, her mother-in-law *Matrona*, her sister-in-law *Catilla*, and her husband *Anicetus*; and her single infant son *Nemetorius* was associated with her in the pious duty.¹ Here the husband has no title, and we cannot suppose that the title of *Basilissa* implied his official position. We must assume that she was deaconess during the life of her husband, who held no official rank. The tomb was evidently erected immediately after his death. Considering that marriages were ordinarily entered on at an early age, we must regard it as probable that *Basilissa* was still young when she made the grave.

Another example of the relation of *Hiereus* and *Presbyteros* may be quoted—

Gourdos, good man, sleeps here like a dove. He was among men priest (*hiereus*) of the Most High God. To him *Trokondas*; his successor and comrade, made a stele in memory doing him honour on his tomb.

(A Cross in relief on each side of the epitaph.)

Trokondas is called the comrade (*ὁπάων*) of the deceased; but the word, like the Latin *comes*, implies indubitably inferiority in position. *Trokondas* was a Deacon and

¹ Rev. H. S. Cronin published it in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1902, p. 359. *Basilissa* is called *διάκονος*, not *διακόνισσα* (for euphony).

Gourdos was his Bishop or Presbyter. The same Gourdos, perhaps, is mentioned in another inscription—

Aur(elius) Gourdos, Presbyter, erected (the tomb of) Tyrannos his adopted son (or foundling son) in remembrance.

The latter epitaph has all the marks of the earliest class of Lycaonian epitaphs; and it might very well be twenty or even forty years earlier than the former, which was engraved on the tomb of Gourdos. The omission of the praenomen Aur. in the former is no proof of diversity in the person: both because this praenomen is frequently found omitted and inserted in different references to the same person,¹ and because the epitaph of Gourdos is in hexameter verse, in which proper names were always treated more freely. The unusual name Gourdos (never elsewhere found) is not likely to have occurred twice in the case of a Presbyter and a Hiererus at Iconium during one century. The Presbyter and the Hiererus were assuredly the same person.

The epitaph of Gourdos is interesting in several respects. It unites the old formula with the new; "here sleeps" is a mere poetic variation of "here lies," while the concluding lines name the maker of the tomb. The occurrence of the old formula at the end in addition to the later formula at the beginning has been regarded above as belonging to the transition period, before the old formula had been forgotten; and most of the cases where the old and the new are united are in metrical epitaphs which seem to belong to the period 340-360 A.D.

The comparison to the dove is suggested by the type found (sometimes in relief, sometimes incised) on many tombstones of Lycaonia. One example, much defaced but still recognizable, from Isaura Nova has already been published²; in 1905 I found several others close to the town.

¹ See *Lycaonian and Phrygian Notes*, in *Classical Review*, 1905, p. 425.

² Miss Ramsay, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 288. As the symbol was then unique in the district, it was unsafe to say anything about its meaning at that time. Now the other examples show what it was intended to represent.

Another is very important: it is engraved on a large block of fine Dorla limestone, 5 feet 2 inches by 3 feet, very like in character to the tomb of the Makarios Papas¹ at Dorla and probably made in the same workshop. The ornamentation is in the triple schema common at Dorla (Isaura Nova). The centre pediment (round) contains a bird (probably intended for a pigeon or dove) standing on the top of a large garland. Below the garland is a bird (the body of which is mutilated behind by fracture of the stone) with a leaf in its mouth; there can be no doubt that this represents the dove, with the leaf in its mouth. The inscription at the top is much obliterated, but it mentions Aur. Domna (distinguished?) by virginity and industry, and her father Aur. Orestianos, son of Cyrus, who made the tomb. We may feel fairly confident that this noble monument is older than 300 A.D. The wife of Orestianos bore the name of Aur. Septimia Domna, which clearly points to the third century: these names must have come into the family about 200 and are not likely to have persisted for a very long time.

The other examples prove that this type of the dove became common in Lycaonia; and finally the epitaph of Gourdos mentions the dove as typical of the deceased Presbyter.

As regards the titles of Church officials, therefore, the usage in those inscriptions, which we have classified as belonging to the fourth century, may be compared with that of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Book II.:—

(1) The inscriptions tend to retain more generally the title Presbyter.

(2) They use the title Bishop more rarely.

(3) They use the title Hiererus, which carries with it the sacerdotal idea, much more rarely.

(4) One inscription has the word "sacred," where the *Constitutions* used "ecclesiastical."

¹ See EXPOSITOR, 1905, p. 214.

These differences are not serious. They point to a slightly more primitive style of expression, which might be explained either because the inscriptions were on the average slightly earlier than the *Constitutions*, or because the inscriptions, though of practically the same period, yet as embodying popular usage were not quite so developed in expression, clung to the simpler terminology, and had not yet adopted the more formal and systematic ecclesiastical or sacerdotal forms of expression. Bearing in mind that the older Lycaonian inscriptions stretch over a considerable period (including both those which have been classified as possibly of the second half of the third century, and those which are probably of the middle of the fourth century), we may fairly regard the comparison as distinctly confirming the chronological scheme which has been adopted.

Setting aside a few which are clearly Byzantine in character, we may hold that the mass of those numerous Lycaonian Christian documents are of the period 260–400. Their abundance during that time, and their rarity later, confirm the general impression that is given by Anatolian epigraphy. Inscriptions on stone become much rarer all over the western parts of the country after 300 A.D. In Lycaonia we have supposed that the inscriptions, becoming numerous at a later date than further west, continued to be common for nearly a century later. This point of view suggests that if our chronology in Lycaonian inscriptions needs modification, the change that is required would be to place them earlier, and not later.

Why did epigraphy die out during the fourth century? Several causes may have contributed to this result, viz. :—

1. It is possible that writing on perishable materials, such as paper, was more practised in the fourth century and later, and writing on stone became less frequent.

2. Fashion may have changed. There can be no doubt that the Christian custom seems to have recoiled from the

exaggerated respect paid among Anatolian pagans to the construction of a tomb as almost the most important and binding of religious duties, and that the form and character of the epitaphs changed towards greater brevity and simplicity. There may probably have been also a change in the way of discarding altogether epitaphs and tombstones.

3. Education probably deteriorated: a bishop of Hadrianopolis in Phrygia, present at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D., had to get a helper to sign for him because he did not know how to write.¹

In publishing these notes on a very difficult subject, my chief aim is to elicit correction or confirmation from other scholars.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE TEXT AND EXEGESIS OF MARK XIV. 41, AND THE PAPYRI.

THE text of this passage according to the viiith edition of Tischendorf runs as follows :

καὶ ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ καθέξτε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε ὁ
ἀπέχει ὁ ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα, ἰδοὺ κ.τ.λ.

The great stumbling block in this verse has always been the apparently meaningless ἀπέχει. Yet modern critics² felt themselves not free to omit it altogether (as perhaps St. Matthew did: xxvi. 45), because it is impossible then to

¹ *Histor. Geogr. of Asia Minor*, p. 92.

² In the *Novum Testamentum Graece* . . in usum studiosorum, by Prof. J. M. S. Baljon, Groningae, 1898, however, the words ἀπέχει ὁ ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα have been printed in brackets. A note is added which runs as follows: ἀπεχει ὁ ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα *absurda lectio est*. Δ ἀπεχει τὸ τέλος καὶ ἡ ὥρα. Michelsen (*Het evangelie van Markus*, pag. 25-27) *conjecit* ἀπεχει τέλος ἡ ὥρα *Mihi videtur* (*Theol. Studien*, 1887, pp. 195-6) ἀπεχει—ὥρα *glossema esse*.

To this opinion the whole of our present inquiry is an objection and perhaps a decisive one. Moreover it is rather difficult to see how De Baljon can consider such a vexed passage as a gloss. Glosses commonly add explanatory matter and are usually distinguished by their plain senselessness.

account for its appearance. That it is since old times a part of the text, and a troublesome part of it, appears from the following synopsis of the MS. evidence, compiled from the apparatus of Tischendorf's viiith edition and the second edition of Westcott and Hort's Appendix.

LATIN.	GREEK.
Cod.	Cod.
a. consummatus est finis advenit hora.	*ἀπέχει ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ἐπῆλθεν ἡ ὥρα.
f. adest finis venit hora.	*ἐπέχει ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα.
d. sufficit finis et hora.	D. ἀπέχει ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ ἡ ὥρα.
c. adest enim consummatio et hora	*ἐπέχει ΓΑΡ ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ ἡ ὥρα.
ff ² . adest enim consummatio et venit hora.	*ἐπέχει ΓΑΡ ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα.
SYRIAC.	GREEK.
Syr. appropinquavit finis et venit hora.	*ἐπέχει (?) ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα.
Syr. ^{sin.} venit hora appropinquavit finis	*ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα ἐπέχει ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ

Besides this evidence we have the testimony of St. Augustine in *De consensu evangelistarum*. iii.,² 11 :

Post illa verba secundum Marcum positum est : sufficit, id est : quod requievistis jam sufficit.

St. Augustine therefore obviously agrees with the Vulgate, which translated in this passage the same text as is given in Tischendorf's viiith edition rendering the separate reading ἀπέχει by what was thought to be an equivalent of it, viz., *sufficit*. St. Augustine's commentary on this passage considers this rendering as an impersonal expression, which

has need of an explanation. It is from here that we may start and consider the following questions coherent with our problem.

- I. Explanations which account for ἀπέχει as an *impersonal* use of the verb.
- II. Explanations in which ἀπέχει is *modified* so as to suit better to this purpose.
- III. The *origin* of this impersonal conception.
- IV. *Euthymius'* comment on the passage.
- V. The *general meaning* of ἀπέχειν in contemporary documents.
- VI. A *possible solution* of the problem.
- VII. The *bearing* of this solution on the general trustworthiness of St. Mark.

I. *Explanations which account for ἀπέχει as an impersonal expression.*

Reckoning only with what came down to us from antiquity we may collect here the testimony (α) of codd. D, d, a, and (β) the *comment* of St. Augustine on the Vulgate reading.

All these authorities consider ἀπέχει as a 3d. ps. sing. of the Present tense of the Indicative of the verb ἀπέχειν, used impersonally.

Yet they differ as to the exact meaning of this word. Those sub (α) considered the word etymologically, and, inserting **ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ** they derived from thence the translation: *consummatus est finis* (α) or *sufficit finis* (d). This latter rendering comes to no sense,¹ the first is a mere translation *ad hoc*.

¹ A. Pallis, *A Few Notes on the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew, based chiefly on Modern Greek* Liverpool, 1903, (a little book—not little in its faults and merits) states—in my opinion—only the simple truth when saying (p. 23), “Then again the attempt to explain how ἀπέχει has come to mean *sufficit* has not proved a success. Besides, as the word is placed in the text, no reader could help connecting it with ὥρα, thus misunderstanding the whole passage as *the hour is distant*

From these various doubts it appears that those primitive translators were far from the confidence with which St. Augustine proposes his conception: *sufficit, i.e.: quod requievistis jam sufficit.*

Though this comment labours under very heavy difficulties it has been unanimously accepted by all modern translations, with an occasional reference to the possibility of some difficulty here. Yet the difficulties are certainly considerable. From an exegetical point of view we can but reluctantly admit that Christ should have uttered His thoughts so incoherently, combining two utterly contradictory phrases so as to form the following confused statement:

"Sleep on now and take your rest! It is enough: the hour has come! Behold the son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners!" etc.

And, without pressing this, there always remains the philological impossibility of translating ἀπέχει or giving any parallel of a similar use. For the translation ἀπέχει = *sufficit* = *it is enough* is wholly gratuitous.

(this being the usual [?] sense of ἀπέχει). Why, moreover, did not the Evangelist say ἀρκεί, so as not to occasion such misunderstanding? Further, even if ἀπέχει meant *sufficit*, it would not at all suit the context; and the explanations so far given are based upon guesses and far-fetched subtleties." Though the different criticisms contained in this passage are not disposed in a clear scholarly way, yet Mr. Pallis has seen that the usual explanations labour under insoluble intricacies, a point which has been overlooked in Dr. Swete's commentary, where we read: "But the sense is doubtless correctly given by the Vg. *sufficit*, 'enough!' . . . The question remains whether ἀπέχει refers to the sleep of the Apostles, or to the ironical reproof. The latter seems to be the better interpretation. . ." On this supposed (out of place) play of irony, cf. sub vi. and the curiously contradictory statements of the commentaries of Holtzmann (*Synoptiker*³), Strack-Zöckler and Keil. Wellhausen, *Das Evang. Marci*, Berlin, 1903, p. 128, gives no more than: "ἀπέχει gehört eng zusammen mit ἐλπεσθε am Anfang von 14.42: es ist genug der Schlafens, steht auf. Was in der mitte steht, verrät, sich schon durch den Menschensohn als sekundär. Auch sind die ἁμαρτωλοί sonst die Heiden, die hier nicht passen." This may be thought to be rather unsatisfactory.

I need but quote Field's *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*, p. 39, who gives the only two parallels known and readily admits their very questionable value: Hesych. Ἀπέχει ἰσχύος, ἐξαρκεῖ, evidently derived from our passage.¹

Pseud.-Anacreon, *Ode* xxviii. 33,² where the poet gives instructions to a painter for the portrait of his mistress, and concludes: Ἀπέχει βλέπω γὰρ αὐτήν | τάχα, κηρὲ, καὶ λαλήσεις, which is translated by Field in the following manner: "Enough—the girl herself I view; so like, 'twill soon be speaking too."

Yet on this place, as is observed by A. Pallis in his *Notes*, p. 23, Stephanus was most likely right in conjecturing ἄπεχε. Yet even if this be thought somewhat rash, it must be admitted that this solitary and doubtful literary instance cannot counterbalance the cumulative evidence of such *non-literary* and, for a large part, *contemporaneous* documents as the Papyri.

The negative side of this evidence, i.e., the entire insignificance of these already weak parallels, amounts almost to certainty when considering that of the 79 instances where the verb ἀπέχειν is used in the Papyri (O I, II, III, IV; F; Tb; A I, II; FP. I. II; GP. II; L I. II.) *none* occurs which quadrates with the supposed meaning *sufficit*, neither is there even one instance of an impersonal use of this verb (cf. v.).

We may, therefore, safely deny that ever the verb

¹ Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. . . Introduction, Appendix,² London, 1896, p. 27 of the *Notes*: "The gloss in Hesychius being doubtless founded on this passage." This ascribing of first-view meanings to a word—blended with other inaccuracies—is quite a method in Hesychius. Cf. Hesychius, Suidas and Cyrillus (Bremensis, quoted by Schleusner) on κισσῶ with the text of Ps. li. 7 (LXX. l.).

² Pseud.-Anacreon, xxviii. 33 and *not* xv. 33 as is found in Swete and in the *Appendix*. A third parallel from Cyril is mentioned and *rejected* by Field², p. 39.

ἀπέχειν was used impersonally, so as to convey the meaning: *it is enough*.

This statement is suggested by what we next are going to treat, viz., the modifying of the reading ἀπέχει into *another* which admitted the supposed impersonal use.

II. *Explanations in which ἀπέχει is modified in order to obtain an impersonal verb.*

Under this heading belong the readings of Codd. *f*, *c*, and *ff*², perhaps also the Syriac versions quoted by Tischendorf as *Syr.*^{1utr.}

The Greek which underlies the Latin *adest* is probably the reading ΕΠΕΧΕΙ which has exactly this meaning and may be obtained by altering only one letter. This is practically certain, as even one cursive shows this reading (W. H. Appendix,² p. 266).

ΕΠΕΧΕΙ, however, makes only then good sense, if we insert, with the MSS. quoted above, the reading **ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ**. This simple solution would of course have met general acceptance if there were not some slight but important difficulties against it.

Just because the sense does fit in very well we are unable to account for the variety of readings which come to no sense. And this is but one of the possible objections.

Another reason for serious doubts appears when considering the readings of *f*, *c*, *ff*² consecutively.

(*f*). ἐπέχει **ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ**, ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα.

(*c*). ἐπέχει **ΓΑΡ ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ** ἡ ὥρα.

(*ff*²). ἐπέχει **ΓΑΡ ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ** ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα.

(*syrr*). ἐπέχει **ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ** ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα.

These readings form no consistent family. They are evidently *Vermittlungen* between some type of text like D: ἀπέχει **ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ** ἡ ὥρα and the edited text, ἀπέχει · ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα.

Though these readings may be plausible and rid us of a

¹ *Syr.*^{utr} or *Syrr.* = Syrus pesittâ and the Harklean Syriac.

long felt difficulty, yet they do not bear the genuine mark of originality, and, therefore, we must leave them for what they may be worth.

III. *The origin of the tendency to explain ἀπέχει in some way as an impersonal form.*

Having discussed two methods of explaining our reading as an impersonal use of the verb and being obliged to abandon them both, we are in the necessity of accounting for the origin of this strange phenomenon.

The first thing which occurs to us on these lines of thought is, of course, the *abruptness* of the present text: *καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἀπέχει· ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα.*

If ἀπέχει cannot be impersonal—as is proved above—at all events its subject is not directly suggested by the context.

From this point of view we may perhaps account for the reading which underlies *syr.^{sin.}*: ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα ἀπέχει **ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ**. Here the subject of ἀπέχει evidently is ἡ ὥρα: “*The hour has got its end,*” ἡ ὥρα ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος (αὐτῆς).

Yet this too is but a secondary reading, for, though ἀπέχει has been translated in the right way (we cannot but anticipate here, cf. v.) yet a construction in which ἡ ὥρα serves in this manner as a subject both to ἦλθεν and ἀπέχει cannot be from the pen of St. Mark.¹ Moreover, the rather awkward insertion of **ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ** is not exactly in favour of this reading, while the meaning of it as a whole does not suggest any ground for its insertion in this context.

Yet the transposition of ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα and ἀπέχει might be original, though it is difficult, not to say impossible to decide here.

IV. *Euthymius' suggestion on this passage.*

By remarkable good luck we are not left alone with

¹ Cf. the excellent introductory essays on Dr. Swete's commentary on St. Mark.

the ancestor of *syr.^{sin.}* in not considering ἀπέχει as an impersonal form of the verb.

A Venice MS. of Theophylact's commentary on St. Mark contains nearly as a scholium the following statement :

Μάρκος δέ φησιν εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν . . . ὅτι Ἀπέχει, τουτέστιν ἔλαβε τὴν κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐξουσίαν ὁ διάβολος.

This comes first and then follows what accounts for the insertion of **ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ** in so many of our authorities, a valuable testimony, though it is wrong in its exposition of ἀπέχει: ἢ Ἀπέχει τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, ἡγουν Πέρας ἔχει, καὶ γὰρ καὶ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ εἶρηκεν ὅτι τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει (Luke xxii. 37). The author himself probably preferred the first explanation, and it does credit to him as well as to the copyist, who found this remark important enough to rank with Theophylact's comments on St. Mark.

Yet we cannot follow him in inserting here the Father of lies. There is nothing in the context which entitles us to link ἀπέχει to such a subject. Contemporary evidence, however, as is fully supplied now by the various collections of Papyri, enables us to acclaim his preference for the first exposition, as far as the exact meaning of ἀπέχει is concerned. To expose this contemporary evidence in a systematical and convenient form is the subject of our next paragraph.

V. *Contemporary use of the verb ἀπέχειν.*

On the fifty-seven Papyri examined,¹ seventy-nine instances were found. Of these the following three must be set apart :

'Απέχειν, in the meaning of *distance*: T. 92/4 (II/.)

'Απέχεσθαι, in the meaning *to abstain from*: O II. 237 viii./12 (·/186).

¹ The following collections were used: *Oxyrhynchus* II, III, IV, *Amherst* II, *Fayyûm*, *Tebtunis*, *Flinders-Petrie* II, *Leiden* I, *Greek Papyri* IId series. The volumes G.P. I, O. I, L. II, A. I, F. P. I furnished no instances of the use of ἀπέχειν.

—, in the meaning *to have received*: O II. 237 viii./20 (.186).

Anywhere else the active is used, most of the documents where it occurs being receipts or contracts, and always in the meaning: *to have received*.

		1st person sing.	3rd person sing.	1st ps. pl.	3d. ps. pl.
Present Indicative.	B.C. 200 ↓ 100	F. 13 8** (170.); LI. S 1/2 (158.), S 3 36 (158.)	FP. II. xviii. 2 a/8 (181.) LI. S. 2/18-23 (158.) LI. S 4/25 (158/).		
	100 ↓ 1	G.P.II. 39 4 (I.).			T. 109/17 (93/).
	A.D. 1 ↓ 100	O II. 267 34 (.36.), 264 116 (.54.); A. II. 103/2 (.90); F. 91 49 ** (.99.).			
	100 ↓ 200	A II. 105 2 (.127.), 128 /104 (.128.), 111/24 (.132.); F. 93/8 (.159.) 97/40** (.178); A II. 102/21 (.180.), 103/2 (.190.). O III. 504/46 (.11).	O III. 496/2 (.127.); A II. 112/20 (.128.); GP. II. 46/14 (.137.); A II. 113/21 (.157.).	GP.II. 44/5 (.101). F. 35/4 (.150.).	F. 98/28 (.123.).
Aor. Ind.	A.D. 100 ↓ 200	O III. 513/53 (.185.); O IV. 719/22 (.193.); O III. 505/9 (.11).	O III. 504/17 (.11.)		
	200 ↓ 300	A II. 96/5 (.213.).			
	300 ↓	GP. II. 74/10, 25, * (.302).			
Pf. Ind.	B.C. 100 ↓		T. 119/30 (93.).		

From this table¹ it is apparent that the indicative of the verb ἀπέχειν is most frequently used in its first person sing. Next comes the third person singular, the proportion being 21 : 14.

¹ The use of the Infinitives, Present and Perfect, dependent from verbal forms as ὁμνῶ, ὁμολογῶ, ὁμολογεῖ, ἀνωμολογήσατο, etc., does not touch the present subject, and tables showing this would be out of place here. The same may be said of the very frequent use of the word ἀποχή—*receipt*.

Among these fourteen instances from 181 B.C.—A.D. 157 none occurs which could in any manner be explained as impersonal.

The meaning *sufficit, it is enough*, is found nowhere in these documents.

The most characteristic feature of the use of ἀπέχειν as it appears here is the strongly marked connection with *debt* and *loan*, which is especially evident in the cases marked with * and **, where the following formulas occur: (*) ἀπέχω . . . ὡς πρόκειται and (**) ἀπέχω . . . καὶ οὐθὲν ἐγκαλῶ. That the single ἀπέχω, however, is not a weaker term appears from documents as G.P. II 74/10. 25* (/302), where both are u-ed in one and the same document *without any different sense*. Cf. G.P. II 31/6, 14 ** (104/.), where the same remark holds good.

The third person singular, being no formula which may occur in signatures or attestations, is never intensified in the manner indicated above. It appears, however, from the context, and also from the analogy with what has just been said about the first ps. sing., that its '*commercial*' meaning—if it may be called so—is not less strongly marked.

Considering, therefore, what has been said in the second half of the first section and combining that with the evidence from the Papyri, we may safely assume that our

(α.) ἀπέχει is never used impersonally.

(β.) ἀπέχει has nowhere the meaning: *sufficit, it is enough*.

(γ.) ἀπέχειν nearly always means *to have received* and that usually in a *commercial* sense.

(δ.) ἀπέχει has no other sense than that which is proper to the third ps. sing. of the Pres. Ind. of the aforesaid verb.

VI. *A possible solution of the problem.* Having refuted all explanations which account for ἀπέχει as an impersonal use of the verb, and having been obliged also to dismiss the explanations of *Syr.^{sin.}* and Euthymius, though admitting

that the translation, given there, was intrinsically right, we are now bound to give a better solution, or to abandon the reading as an *absurda lectio*.

This latter alternative may be thought rather unsafe in the face of the unanimous testimony of all antiquity.

Before we think of that we must of course have tried to find a better way out of this difficulty. The meaning of ἀπέχει has been defined as “*he has received*” with an additional notion of a strongly “commercial” character.

In the first place we must, therefore, represent to ourselves the situation, and then ask which meaning these words may have when used by Christ under these circumstances. In the first half of the fourteenth chapter, St. Mark has told what Judas had been doing: *And Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went unto the chief priests, to betray Him unto them, (11) and when they heard it, they were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently betray Him.*

This was known to Christ, for in verse 18 seq. the narrative goes on: *And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, one of you which eateth with Me shall betray Me. (19) And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto Him one by one, Is it I? And another said, Is it I? (20) And He answered and said unto them, It is one of the twelve that dippeth with Me in the dish.* If St. Mark gives us to understand that Jesus knew that it was Judas who should betray Him, it is highly probable that Christ must be thought to have supposed that the promise of money was the motive.

The avarice of Judas was well known. We need but remember, e.g., John xii. 6: “*This he said, not that he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein.*” Instances of this are frequent enough in the Gospels, and Judas’ love of money belongs to the common stock of all four.

Bearing this in our mind we come to the surroundings of our text :—

Mark xiv. 41: Καὶ ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε. ἀπέχει ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα· ἰδοὺ, παραδίδεται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἡμαρτωλῶν. (42) ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν· ἰδοὺ, ὁ παραδιδούς με ἤγγισεν.

(43) Καὶ εὐθὺς, ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, παριγίνεται Ἰουδᾶς ὁ Ἰσκιριώτης εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος κ.τ.λ. —

It appears from the context (ver. 43) that Jesus saw Judas and his troop while He was speaking the words related in verses 41 and 42.

This accounts for the apparent abruptness of His speech. For the third time Christ returns from the inner part of Gethsemane. Finding His disciples asleep for the third time, He did not intend to awake them, but only addresses the sleeping three with the well known “*Sleep on now and take your rest.*”

Then in the same instance His eye is struck by a glimpse of torches moving on beneath. Ἀπέχει, He exclaims; Judas *did receive* the promised money. *The hour is come, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.*

Rise up, let us go : he that betrayeth Me is at hand.

And immediately, while He yet spake, cometh Judas, one of the twelve, and with him a great multitude . . .”

We may suppose that this exposition bears its justification in itself. It is in perfect concord with grammar and contemporary use, and suits entirely the peculiar vividness of style for the picturesqueness of which St. Mark was known.

Analyzing it somewhat further we may point to the agreement between “*he did receive*¹ (the promised money)”

¹ Some exact parallels of this use of ἀπέχει, standing by itself, are furnished by the *Leyden Papyri*, vol. i. pag. 97. Papyrus S2a (Catalogue i. 409), from 158 B.C., gives these parallels in ll. 17 seq. :

1. γ' Μεχείρ ις' Τεέβης

Θροιαδέσματος α + σν' ἀπέχει

ιθ' θροιαδέσματος α + σν' ἀπέχει

and the other half of the sentence, "*the Son of man is betrayed.*" Further, the supposed insertion in thought of the "promised money" is required by the meaning of the word ἀπέχει, and its omission is wholly accounted for by remembering the notion of *stipulated loan or debt*¹ which is invariably connected with that verb.

When accepting this solution we need not look for an ill-placed irony in Jesus' words in this supreme moment. On the contrary: our Lord does not think of grudging sleep to His feeble disciples. He cares for Judas, the lost sheep from *the flock of twelve*,² and His first thought on seeing His foes is: he did receive his money,³ he did not stand the temptation!

VII. *The bearing of this solution on the general trustworthiness of St. Mark.*

In itself our solution of the ἀπέχει-problem should be of no great importance as regards the trustworthiness of the Gospel historian. Yet it is not a single instance, but only *one proof more* of that artistic conception and true genius which makes St. Mark so much more like our ideal of the

and so on, five lines, with notations on the sale of θροιαδέσμαι (perhaps, *tinders*), each notation followed by ἀπέχει in a somewhat smaller type, of the same kind as some additional notes higher on the page, as I was able to see on inspecting the Papyrus. Here ἀπέχει is exactly parallel to the English "*paid*," and furnishes a striking parallel to the discussed passage.

¹ This had already been observed by Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 229, and Van Herwerden, *Lex. supplet. et dial.* s.v., and is mentioned also by Dr. Swete, p. 348. Cf. Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16; Luke vi. 24; Phil. iv. 18; Philem. 15.

² Cf. the constant use of εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, *being one of the twelve*. In our present text this is a kind of formula, a connecting link in the vivid abruptness of the narrative.

³ Prof. K. Lake drew my attention to a passage in the *Acta Joannis* (ed. Bonnet, p. 193), dealing with the deed of the unrepentant Fortunatus, where the words Ἀπέχει τὸ τέκνον σου διάβολε have no need of being corrected into ἀπέχεις. They give good sense when translated in the following manner: "Your son, O Devil, has received (his loan)," the loan of sin being death.

historian than any other evangelist, though each of them has his proper merits.

I need but refer to the introductory essays in the second edition of Dr. H. B. Swete's *The Gospel according to St. Mark*.

In itself this mentioning of Jesus' thinking of Judas is but a slight trace, yet it is the numerous traces of this kind which leave on the sober student of St. Mark's narrative the indelible impression of a wholly peculiar originality and a keen historical sense.

Before ending we may meet one somewhat flat objection. All history contains a subjective element. The author is always present, most when he is best concealed. We never see history save through the double medium of our personality and that of our authority. In other words, phantasy plays an important, a combining rôle in all—even in the most sober—science. If we are asked, therefore, How could St. Mark know what Jesus thought and said in the moment that He perceived that Judas had indeed completed his treason, we may go further and reply with the question: Who told St. Mark the words which our Lord spoke to His Father in the inner parts of Gethsemane?

And if we consider such passages well, we cannot but return to the perhaps old-fashioned, but at all events honest, confession, that it was God's inspiring Spirit which led the Evangelists on these paths and caused them to write those words which reflect so fully and harmoniously the spirit of Christ, that we cannot but accept them as His own.

J. DE ZWAAN.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D.	
Again the Authorship of the Last Verses of Mark	401
Rev. Professor W. H. Bennett, D.D., Litt.D.	
The Life of Christ according to St. Mark	128, 262
Very Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., D.C.L.	
Authority and Infallibility	172
Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.	
The Meaning of " Hatred " in the New Testament . . .	153
Dom Chapman, O.S.B.	
The Original Contents of the Codex Bezae	46
The Earliest New Testament	119
Rev. A. R. Eagar, D.D.	
The Greater Sin : a Note on St. John xix. 11	33
Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, D.D.	
Studies in the First Epistle of St. John	380
Rev. Professor A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.	
Studies in the " Inner Life " of Jesus :	
The Limitation of Christ's Knowledge	241
The Causes of Offence	424
Rev. H. J. Gibbins, M.A., B.D.	
The Problem of the Second Epistle of St. John	412
Professor J. Rendel Harris, M.A.	
" Spoken by Jeremy the Prophet "	161
J. H. A. Hart, M.A.	
The Lord Reigned from the Tree	321

	PAGE
Rev. George Jackson, B.A.	
The Ethical Teaching of St. Paul :	
7. The Ethics of Speech	61
8. Asceticism True and False	180
9. Cases of Conscience	269
10. Anger and the Self-Assertive Virtues	370
Rev. M. Kaufmann, M.A.	
Is the New Testament Teaching Optimistic?	137
Rev. F. Warburton Lewis, B.A.	
The Suffering God	40
Rev. George Milligan, M.A., D.D.	
The Eschatology of 2 Thessalonians ii. 1-12	99
Rev. James Moffatt, D.D.	
Literary Illustrations of the Book of Daniel	74
Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, B.D.	
The Study of the Synoptic Gospels Exemplified by Matthew v. 21, 22	17
Professor W. M. Flinders Petrie, D.C.L., LL.D.	
The Census of the Israelites	148, 240
Professor W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.	
Ephesus	81
Iconium	193, 281, 351
The Christian Inscriptions of Lycaonia	438
Rev. C. Anderson Scott, M.A.	
" The Sufferings of Christ." A Note on 1 Peter i. 11	234
Rev. Professor G. A. Smith, D.D., LL.D.	
Isaiah's Jerusalem	1
Sennacherib and Jerusalem	215
Manasseh's Jerusalem	303
Jerusalem and Deuteronomy	336
Rev. Newport J. D. White, D.D.	
The Revealing of the Trinity	254
Rev. Prebendary B. Whitefoord, M.A., D.D.	
New Testament Teaching on Lawlessness	53
J. De Zwaan.	
The Text and Exegesis of Mark xiv. 41, and the Papyri	459

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis xvii. 13, 14	173	Daniel ii. 40	78
xxxviii. 4, 5	157	iii. 22, 25	80
Exodus xv. 6	169	15	78
xviii. 21	157	iv. 4, 5	78
Numbers i.-iii.	148	v. 27	78
xvi.	148	vii. 1-17	79
Deuteronomy vi. 4	262	25	108
xii. 31	157	xi. 33-36	74
xxvii. 25	170	36	107
1 Kings xviii. 4	304	43-45	75
2 Kings xiv. 13	16	xii. 3	75
xviii. 8	216	9, 10, 13	76
13-16	225	Zechariah ii. 7	416
xx. 20	14	xi. 12	161
xxi. 1	308	[xii. 12	169
1-18	309	Matthew ii. 23	25
2 Chronicles xix. 5-11	29	iv. 23	30
xxvi. 9	16	v. 8	248
xxxii. 5	16	21, 22	17
30	14	vii. 15	112
xxxiii. 14	320	23	54
Psalms xvi. 11	147	x. 22	138
lxviii. 27	169	34-39	153
cx.	263	xi. 25-30	242
cxxxviii. 8-9	417	xv. 17	245
Proverbs vi. 12, 13	169	22, 23	429
Isaiah iii. 10	169	xix. 30	21
ix. 2-7	11	xxii. 41-45	253
xxii. 1-14	222	xxiii. 17	30
xxvi. 10	113	28	54
xxx. 6	217	xxiv. 8	239
xxxi. 9	7	45	459
xxxvi. 1	222	xxvii. 9	161
xxxix. 1-8	12	Mark ii. 9	21
xlili. 20	420	v. 13	251
xlix. 21	417	x. 47-8	429
lvii. 4	107	xi. 27-33	129
lxi. 8	157	xii. 1-12	131
Jeremiah vii. 18	314	13-17	132
xi. 13	305	18-27	134
xix. 4	309	28-34	262
xxix. 32	106	35-7	263
Ezekiel xiii. 7-9	320	38-40	265
xvi. 3	1	41-44	266

	PAGE		PAGE
Mark xiii. 14	108	1 Corinthians xii. 13	257
xiv. 18	469	2 Corinthians i. 17	69
41	459	iv. 10	142
63-64	32	vi. 14	55
xvi. 9-20	402	Galatians iii. 27	257
Luke ii. 25	425	v. 23	191
vii. 2, 38	21	vi. 11	294
x. 20	145	Ephesians iv. 29	63
xiv. 25, 26	153	v. 1-7	131
xxiv. 26, 27	237	4	63
xv. 15	20	Colossians ii. 20-23	181
John i. 11	424	iii. 5	191
vi. 26	431	9	69
64	249	1 Thessalonians ii. 16	108
ix. 35	246	v. 2	102
xii. 6	469	2 Thessalonians ii. 1-12	99
xvii. 12	107	5	118
xix. 11	33	iii. 7-12	102
xxi. 18	247	1 Timothy ii. 1	57
Acts ii. 23	55	iii. 16	105
xiii. 6	105	iv. 1-5	182
xxi. 21	106	v. 13	63
xxvi. 22, 23	170	Hebrews i. 9	55
Romans iii. 14	62	ii. 9	45
iv. 7	55	James i. 20	28
vi. 5	257	1 Peter i. 11	234
viii. 13	191	v. 13	421
ix. 13	158	1 John iii. 4	54
xiii. 1, 3	106	3	419
xiv. 5	270	2 John 1	413
xv. 1	271	3 John 11	50
1 Corinthians iii. 18	30	Revelation v. 6	44
vi. 12	275	xiii. 5-8	103
ix. 27	192	xviii. 14	283

